



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Homophobia/Homosexism and Gender Role Rigidity:
A Study in the Social Construction and Control of Masculinity

Laura M. Davis

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Sociology

Presented in Partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

June 1992

© Laura M. Davis, 1992



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file / Votre référence

Our file / Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-81010-6

Canada

ABSTRACT

Homophobia/Homosexism and Gender Role Rigidity: A Study in the Social Construction and Control of Masculinity

Laura M. Davis

This thesis explores the connection between the higher incidence of gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism in men. Thirty in-depth interviews were conducted with female and male undergraduate students at Concordia University. Some specific elements of behaviour and attitudes in regards to gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism were explored in this study.

The connection between gender role rigidity and homosexuality in men is related to the fact that our society places a higher value on being male. Males are more diligent about keeping within the proscriptions of masculinity because to appear in any way "feminine" is to experience a loss of status.

The social construction of masculinity includes two crucial elements; to be a "real man" in our society is to be (1) "not a woman" and (2) "not a homosexual". Both gay men and women are devalued in our society. The greater fear and prejudice which heterosexual men feel toward gay men is an important factor in the maintenance of "masculinity".

This study found that males are more gender role rigid, and more homophobic/homosexist than females. Further, the variable of Sexual Fixedness proved to be an important factor in making the connection between gender rigidity and homophobia/homosexism in males.

Acknowledgments

In general, I dedicate this work to women and men everywhere who are conscious of the burden gender brings, and especially to those who are not. More specifically this work is for Donald McCulloch, my partner and my love; and Gladys Maxfield-Davis who had many dreams which in another time and place would have come true.

Further, I wish to express my gratitude primarily to Dr. Fran Shaver, my thesis advisor, who offered useful and specific advise but gave me the freedom I needed. Also to Dr Chantal Collard and Angela Rosenthal for their time, my thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
PAGES: 1-4

CHAPTER 1
LITERATURE REVIEW
PAGES: 5-55

CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY
PAGES: 56-78

CHAPTER 3
MAKING CONNECTIONS:
GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY, HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM, AND GENDER.
PAGES: 79-95

CHAPTER 4
THE RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER VARIABLES
PAGES: 96-146

CHAPTER 5
THE CONCLUSION
PAGES: 147-158

APPENDIX A
GENDER ROLE AND SEXUALITY ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE
PAGES: 159-170

BIBLIOGRAPHY
PAGES: 171-174

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	"Attitude on Promotion of Equality for women by Gender"	pg.82
Table 2a	"Female Type Tasks done by living Arrangement"	pg.82
TABLE 2b	"Male Type Tasks done by living Arrangements"	pg.82
TABLE 3	"Women responsible for deterioration of nuclear family"	pg.85
TABLE 4	"Biological inequality by gender"	pg.85
TABLE 5	"Sexual experience threat by Gender"	pg.85
TABLE 6	"Gender Role Rigidity and gender"	pg.87
TABLE 7	"Equal rights for homosexuals/ homosexuality a threat/homosexuals should stay in closet"	pg.89
TABLE 8	"Contact and willingness to have contact with homosexual males/ lesbians/by gender"	pg.91
TABLE 9	"Gay Bar Attendance by Gender"	pg.91
TABLE 10	"Lesbian Bar Attendance by Gender"	pg.91
TABLE 11	"Homophobia/homosexism and Gender"	pg.92
TABLE 12	"Occupations typed as MALE better suited by Gender, and gender role rigidity"	pg.98
TABLE 13	"Occupations typed as FEMALE better suited by Gender, and gender role rigidity"	pg.99

LIST OF TABLES...CONTINUED

TABLE 14	"Traits most Admired in MEN/by Males"	pg.104
TABLE 15	"Traits most Admired in MEN/ by Females"	pg.105
TABLE 16	"Traits most Admired in Women/ by Males"	pg.109
TABLE 17	"Traits most Admired in Women/ by Females"	pg.110
TABLE 18	"Reasons for Homosexuality/ by Gender, and homophobia/homosexism"	pg.119
TABLE 19	"Reasons for Lesbianism/by gender, and homophobia/homosexism"	pg.119
TABLE 20	"I.D. of Homosexuals/by gender, and homophobia/homosexism"	pg.127
TABLE 21	"I.D. of Lesbians/by gender, and homophobia/homosexism"	pg.127
TABLE 22	"Gay Male Stereotypes/Mannerisms"	pg.131
TABLE 23	"Gay Male Stereotypes/Appearance"	pg.132
TABLE 24	"Gay Male Stereotypes/Other"	pg.133
TABLE 25	"Stereotypes of Lesbians/ Mannerisms"	pg.137
TABLE 26	"Stereotypes of Lesbians/ Appearance"	pg.138
TABLE 27	"Stereotypes of Lesbians/ Other"	pg.138
TABLE 28	"Occupational Attraction for Homosexual Men/by Gender, and Homophobia/homosexism"	pg.140
TABLE 29	"Occupational Attraction for Lesbians/by Gender, and homophobia/ homosexism"	pg.141

INTRODUCTION

This research posits that gender role rigidity is higher among men than women in our society, and that concern with "traditional" gender role scripts is likely to be correlated with a higher degree of homosexuality. Homosexism, a term coined by G. Lehne in 1975, is a distinct form of homophobia which pertains to the specific dislike for homosexuals of the same biological sex. The idea that both gender role rigidity and homosexuality is higher in men is related to the way in which "masculinity" as a social construct within our society is depicted, and transmitted.

The depiction of what it is "to be a man" includes "not being a woman", and "not being homosexual". The transmission of "masculinity" involves being anxious about appearing "feminine", a status which is devalued in comparison with "masculinity", and mistakenly connected to homosexuality in men. To appear like the "opposite" less valued gender is to run the risk of also appearing like a member of a sexually devalued group in our society, homosexuals. Thus, boys are often teased when they do not run fast enough or act tough enough, "what are you, a girl?" or "what are you, a fag?". Both groups are devalued, both accusations are seen as insults to males in our society.

The concentration within the social sciences on "masculinity" as a social construct, does not appear to warrant the same degree of attention as does "femininity". However, studies of male homosexuality, as opposed to lesbianism, are the focus of far more research. Much of this research stresses

that most gay men do not act like women, rather than exploring what would be wrong with it if they did (Kayal, 1977:95). In other words, "saving" gay males from the "stigma" of femininity appears to be a consistent research goal, as is encouraging women to be more like men.

Encouraging women to enter male dominated occupations and adopt the "masculine cloak" reinforces "masculinity" as the normative role. For example, within the area of gender research in sociology, as well as other social sciences, it is generally the female role that is the specimen under the microscope. Although the sociology of gender implies that both "femininity" and "masculinity" are social constructs and thus should be critically analyzed, more often than not "the sociology of gender" becomes translated into "the sociology of women".

The "sociology of women", without the "sociology of men" implies that men are genderless and that women should modify their "deficient" gender to emulate them. In the academic journals, social scientists tend to operate within their own systems of legitimacy so that even with the best intentions they tend to speak from the ideological perspective of hegemonic masculinity. This fundamental bias is echoed in research conducted on homosexuality, which tends to reaffirm heterosexuality as the "norm". As Kayal wrote (1977:95):

Sociology textbooks constantly refer to phenomena like homosexuality, women's rights or race relations as social problems which are then equated with dislocations and deviations as if consensus or the established order might not also be a problem.

Although many studies within the mainstream literature still contain vestiges of patriarchy and homophobia in their

articulation, it should be stressed that all research in the area is valuable. However, this research should be built upon rather than reiterated. Research in the area of gender and sexuality appears to have reached an ideological impasse. Mackie (1983:290) argues that the sociology of gender has adopted much from the liberal feminist school which maintains that equal access to education, power, and privilege will bring about perfect equality. Mackie cites Ambert on the progression of feminist thought:

When one reads the new feminists side by side with the ones from the previous generations, and even centuries, one is struck by the fact that, of what is being currently said and written, very little is new: it is an ever-repeating script...[this] repetition attests to the overall lack of change that has taken place in the condition of women (Mackie, 1983:290).

Since it will be argued within the pages of this thesis that the social construction of "masculinity" involves an inherent devaluation of "femininity", equal access to power and education may not go very far in alleviating gender inequality. Further, the denial and devaluation of "femininity" in men by society as well as by men themselves -- which is evident in the connection of male homosexuality with "femininity" -- is a further indication that gender inequality has less to do with what women should do in society, and more to do with what men will not.

What men "will not do" is related to that which is thought to be "feminine". Chapter one reviews the literature that demonstrates that males are more gender rigid and homosexist, and that these two attitudes are connected to the way in which "masculinity" is socially constructed.

Support for the theoretical rationale being proposed between gender role rigidity and homosexuality in men was gathered from several areas. Cross cultural and historical data show that there is, and has been, a connection between the way "masculinity" is constructed and homosexuality is viewed. Further, the construction of "masculinity" in our own society which takes heterosexuality as one of its central cores, along with the denial and devaluation of femininity, will be examined. Finally, studies which have been conducted demonstrating the higher correlation of gender role rigidity, homophobia, as well as homosexuality in men will be discussed.

CHAPTER ONE:LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature clarifying the proposed relationship between gender role rigidity in men and homosexuality. HOMOSEXISM is a product of HOMOPHOBIA, in that both terms refer to the fear and or intolerance of homosexuality and lesbianism. However, homosexuality carries a more specific meaning: homosexual individuals are significantly more rejecting of same sex homosexuals. Thus, homosexuality takes place between members of the same gender group rather than being directed towards members of the "other" gender category. Within this definition, the homosexual individual would automatically be homophobic, as homosexuality implies that prejudice and or intolerance of either gays or lesbians is present. However, the homophobic individual may not necessarily be homosexual. That is, an individual may disapprove of homosexuality and lesbianism in general, harbouring no more dislike for one or the other.

The distinction between homophobia and homosexuality is crucial to understanding the social control of masculinity. The relationship between homosexuality in males and gender role rigidity is not one of simple causality, rather the two attitudes serve to reinforce each other. Since a devaluation of homosexuality and women already exists in the larger society, it is not being proposed that gender role rigidity (which refers to traditional adherence to gender role behaviour and attitudes) is caused by homosexuality or homophobia. Rather, a higher prevalence of homosexuality in males can be seen as a manifestation of gender role rigidity, or in other words, a concern with deviating from a role which is more highly valued

within our society. Inversely, individuals who are concerned with their own gender behaviour will likely be hostile towards those of the same gender whom they feel are deviating from gender norms. This research posits that there is likely to be a high correlation between the two attitudes, especially among males in our society, because homosexism can be equated with the "maintenance of sex roles by individuals of the same sex" (Lehne, 1975:67). Since males have more to gain by remaining within the boundaries of their respective gender roles, they are more likely to hate and/or fear those of the same biological sex they perceive to have violated that role. In this sense, an individual who is concerned with the maintenance of the status quo in terms of gender roles is also likely to be homophobic. Although homophobia is composed of more than just a concern with gender roles, (i.e. religious, and/or moral objection, ignorance etc.); homosexism (prejudice towards homosexuals of the same gender) is more likely to be found among gender rigid individuals.

The role of homosexism in the social control of masculinity relates to the two central components in the social construction of masculinity, which are heterosexuality, and a devaluation of "femininity". Further, the mistaken belief that gay men act and appear like women (i.e., the sexual inversion myth) is correlated with the lower status of women and male homosexuals in our society. The lower status of these two groups helps to keep men within the boundaries of their traditional gender role. This position will become theoretically clearer further on in this chapter.

In demonstrating the correlation between being a male

in our society, and the fear and intolerance of homosexuality, (especially in regards to male homosexuality), this research will operate within the framework of the social construction of reality. To view "masculinity" and "homosexuality" (which includes lesbianism) as social constructs implies, in the words of Berger and Luckmann, that:

...There is no human nature in the sense of a biologically fixed substratum determining the variability of socio-cultural formations. But the specific shape into which this humanness is moulded is determined by those socio-cultural formations and is relative to their numerous variations. While it is possible to say that man (sic) has a nature, it is more significant to say that man (sic) constructs his (sic) own nature, or more simply, that man (sic) produces himself (sic) (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:49).

Berger and Luckmann continue to state that nowhere is the "plasticity of the human organism" more apparent than in regards to sexuality:

Ethnological evidence shows that, in sexual matters, man (sic) is capable of almost anything. One may stimulate one's sexual imagination to a pitch of feverish lust, but it is unlikely that one can conjure up any image that will not correspond to what in some other culture is an established norm, or at least an occurrence to be taken in stride.

In regards to the assertions made by Berger and Luckmann, anthropological data can be invaluable in supporting the premise that gender and sexuality are variable rather than constant. Although it may appear that one's sex "naturally" corresponds to some particular attitudes or behaviours in terms of gender and sexual orientation, this conceptualization loses much of its credibility in the face of cross-cultural evidence. What it means to "be a man" in our culture, for example, may or may not correspond to what "masculinity" means among the

Tchambuli of New Guinea who, according to Mead, "are decorative and adorned...carve and paint and practice dance steps..." while the women are "...brisk and unadorned.....fish and go to market" (Mead, 1950:69).

Since we are operating within the social construction of reality framework, it is appropriate that our analysis "be carried on in a continuous conversation with both history and philosophy" (Berger and Luckman, 1967:189). The claim that homosexism acts to socially control "masculinity" in our contemporary western society can be better understood within the deeper analysis of historical and cross-cultural data. In order to better understand the present connection, several questions should be addressed: (1) If masculinity varies, that is, if the proscriptions of "masculinity" vary over time as well as cross-culturally, does the attitude towards homosexuality in men vary also? (2) Can a connection be made between gender role rigidity and homosexism in men cross culturally, and if so, (3) how are they connected historically and cross-culturally? In response to these questions, two main points must be stressed. First, masculinity is a variable, as is sexuality. Secondly, although masculinity and the attitude towards homosexuality vary, what appears to be consistent is the utilization of male homosexuality--be it by its promotion in particular circumstances, or oppression--to reinforce the cult of hegemonic masculinity.

SEXUALITY AND CHRISTIANITY

It may be useful here to point out that early Christian philosophy may not be as responsible for our societies inherent homophobia as once believed. A stake in

preserving hegemonic masculinity would serve as a much more viable hypothesis in tracing the attitudes towards male homosexuality in western society. Although the Christian bible is often consulted when attempting to uncover the ideological origins of homophobia, the early church was not that concerned with homosexuality. Early medieval values were not specifically anti-homosexual, [they were anti-sex]. In Roby's article on the early medieval attitudes to homosexuality (1977:70), he states that "sodomy was put on a level of equality with heterosexual fornication and regarded without any special horror" (1977:70).

Further, passive homosexuality in men appears to be much more of a concern than homosexuality in general. Roby cites the Justinian code as evidence that the objection to homosexuality, which is clearly spelled out in sections 538 and 544, relates more to the condemnation of men who take the sexual position of women. Roby cites several sections which demonstrate that passive homosexuality is connected clearly with gender inversion:

All persons who have the shameful custom of condemning a man's body, acting the part of a woman's, to the sufferance of an alien sex (for they appear not to be different from women) shall expiate a crime of this kind in avenging flames in the sight of people (Roby, 1977:71).

Although there were many references to sodomy and buggery in the early church as being evil, Roby cautions that in the early middle ages these terms were much more fluid than in the 20th century. For example, overeating or taking interest on a loan were both referred to as sodomy by preachers of the age (Roby, 1977).

Michael Kimmel, a historical sociologist who has done extensive research on the social changes surrounding masculinity through history has predicted that homophobia is currently on the rise (1987:9). He draws this conclusion by correlating anti-homosexual sentiment with periods of transition in terms of gender role expectations. Kimmel rationalizes that the greater anxiety men feel in regards to how they should behave in order to qualify as "masculine", the more threatening the male homosexual becomes (Kimmel, 1987:9). In view of this, if we are to claim that religious ideology alone explains anti-homosexual sentiment then it would follow that homophobia would correlate positively with religiosity. However, our society is becoming more and more secularized, but not less homophobic.

HOMOSEXUALITY IN ANTIQUITY

A consistent factor in views of homosexuality in men, historical and cross-cultural, is its role in protecting the fragility of "masculinity". In ancient Greece, commonly seen as an example of total openness towards homosexuality, the practice of homosexuality was contained within the specific relationship of pederasty. Ungaretti (1978) examines the conception of homosexuality between men by drawing on literature of the classical period. He explains that Ancient Greece was highly competitive in terms of the masculine cult, an extremely "macho" society. Men had to prove themselves over and over, in the Olympic Games, the Pythian and other athletic games. Ungaretti states:

...A culture that defined masculinity by status, victory, and independence pushed a man to reinforce his own self-image by assuming superior status and dependence of all those in his immediate circle (Ungaretti, 1978:295).

The relationship of pederasty in Ancient Greece involved the older man who was the "active" sexual initiator and the younger man who was sexually "passive". Homosexuality was not socially accepted among men of equal status. The kind of relationship allowed between men left the male role intact as the pederast model was accepted along the lines of father/child or husband/wife. Since the family in ancient Greece was for the purpose of economic and social security, rather than for the satisfaction of sexual needs, this model functioned as part of a larger system of sexual and emotional outlets.

The entire family and pederastic system was maintained by careful attention to a strict concept of masculinity that emerged from the warrior/hero ethic (Ungaretti, 1978:298).

This allowance of homosexuality between the older active and younger passive man created a tight knit cult of masculinity where younger men were directly taught the masculine ethos from older men. Women then were not even needed for satisfaction of emotional and sexual needs which further reinforced their exclusion from "the male universe".

...the pederastic model provided the adult lover with sexual variety, companionship, and a reinforcement of his superior status. It provided the youthful male beloved with a good, responsible model to emulate as well as someone who could initiate him into the ways of becoming a man. In this manner a male dominated culture could provide for the continued dominance of masculine values and ethics (Ungaretti, 1978:299-300).

The important point here is that within this specific context, homosexuality between men was used to reinforce masculinity.

E. Berthe wrote of Greek male homosexuality, "...sodomy was believed to be the best way to communicate bravery to a young warrior" (Berthe in Merquior, 1985:136). Passive homosexuality was reserved for the youth. That is, homosexuality was not encouraged among men, but between dominant older males and submissive younger ones.

Active homosexuality has a long history of legitimation, however, passive homosexuality has long been devalued in men. This trend is evident in the pederastic relationship described above, as well as in Ancient Rome. As Paul Veyne (cited in Aries and Bejin, 1986:30) argued:

The passive homosexual was not rejected for his homosexuality, but for his passivity, a very serious moral, or rather, political infirmity. Roman society never bothered to ask if people were homosexual or not, but it devoted an excessive amount of scrutiny to tiny details of dress, speech, gesture, and deportment in furthering its contempt for those who showed a lack of virility.

The distinction between the passive homosexual and the active homosexual goes beyond Ancient Greece. Immanuel Reynaud (1983) argues that this passive-active distinction is also a contemporary one:

...the homosexual is not really the man who has sexual intercourse with another man, but rather he who is supposed to be passive: the "queen", the "poof", the "fairy"...in short, a woman. Whereas man can consider homosexuality in its "active" form as a means of asserting his power, in its "passive" form it is, on the contrary, a symbol of humiliation (Reynaud, 1983:54).

This argument clarifies why homosexuality in Ancient Greece was of the pederastic variety. The passive youth's role was quickly changed to the active when he became a "man". Further, Paul Veyne (1986) and Immanuel Reynaud (1983) both report that in Ancient Rome and Greece, a common form of humiliation in battle

was to perform sodomy on the captured enemy.

By the Classical period, evidence suggests that the concept of masculinity was undergoing changes. Ungaretti (1978) points to the writings of Aristophanes, a satirist who criticized what he saw as contemporary trends towards effeminate behaviour which was related to the progressive weakening of the warrior/hero ethic.

Greater logic argues for the older times when men were men. He ridicules the soft, physically inactive side of current life in Athens. Later, he is moved to admit, as he surveys the audience, that all the established older men sitting there are euruproktoi (literally; having broad anuses; sexually having had sodomy performed on them quite often)(Ungaretti,1978:298).

Aristophanes goes on to say that men are also becoming "euruproktoi" because of the "sedentary, non-heroic, non-battle oriented life" (Ungaretti, 1978:298), but more importantly, "older men are losing their dominance over younger men" (typified by their submissive role in the homosexual act (Ungaretti, 1978:298). Ungaretti concluded that the fear of loss of dominance in the pederastic model was associated with the fear that men would display powerlessness and submission to the whims of one's dependents (Ungaretti, 1978:299). Thus, a breakdown in this model was seen as a threat to the family and to the transmission of traditional male values to coming generations.

CROSS CULTURAL COMPARISON

The Berdache among North American Indians are defined by Callender and Kochems (1983:443) as "...usually male... anatomically normal but assumed the dress, occupations, and behaviour of the other sex to effect a change in gender status".

The Berdache did not necessarily have homosexual tendencies, in fact, "North American homosexuality transcended berdache...their orientations could be bisexual or heterosexual" (Callender and Kochems, 1983:444). What is important about the status of the Berdache for our purposes involves gender mixing and its relationship with homosexual activity.

The study of the Berdache status has been unfortunately so distorted by Western ethnocentricity that the relationship of sex and gender is difficult to decipher. We know that the Berdache were mostly males, although some female Berdache did indeed exist. Devereux (1937) depicted the "Hwame" among the Mohave as women who took the role of men in work and sexual activity. Although this interpretation should be accepted with great caution, Devereux reports that:

The Mohave recognize only two definite types of homosexuality, male transvestites taking the role of women in sexual intercourse known as "alyha". Female homosexuals, assuming the role of male known as hwame. Their patterns are not considered homosexual and from evidence of our case-histories appear to have been invariably persons of bisexual tendencies, who did not go through any informal initiation and were not designated by any special name (Devereux, 1937: 500-501).

In spite of many assumptions in regards to the Berdache status, Devereux identifies an important point about sexual position; their gender status allowed them more freedom in respect to sexual expression. In most societies, male Berdache were designated a higher status due to the many advantages they held for the particular society in which they appeared. According to Callender and Kochems (1983), the Berdache were considered sacred and because they were allowed to cross the division of

labour line, they often brought great economic prosperity. Rather than being considered a male or a female, the berdache was seen as a third gender combination. The idea that they also became homosexual as a result of this gender mixing should be interpreted as an additional feature of their role rather than a central one.

The status of the Berdache in regards to sexual practices varies from culture to culture. Some cultures considered homosexual activity a significant aspect of the status, others did not. Callender and Kochem contend that:

...homosexual relations with Berdache were generally accepted as long as they did not obstruct "normal" marriages or in some cultures take the form of these (Callender and Kochems, 1988:450).

What appears to be consistent is that the sexual partners of the Berdache were always non-berdache (Callender and Kochems, 1988:450). It was the gender flexibility that allowed for the sexual flexibility. A non-berdache was allowed that freedom only with a berdache.

Accounts of the modes of intercourse practiced by Berdache who engaged in same gender sexual activity is rare. Devereux (1937) gives us one of those rare descriptions with the Mohave. Devereux describes the "alyha" and the "hwame" as "transvestites" who "...must attempt to duplicate the behaviour pattern of his (sic) adopted sex and make "normal" individuals of his (sic) anatomic sex feel toward him as though he truly belonged to his (sic) adopted sex" (Devereux, 1937: 502).

There was not condemnation of homosexuality for the "Alyha" and the "hwame" among the Mohave because it was institutionalized as part of their status; a status which was

considered neither male nor female. Hill's examination of the "Nadle" (the Navaho term for both hermaphrodite and transvestite) among the Navaho indicates that they were highly regarded (Hill, 1935:273). "Nadles" did the work of both men and women and therefore brought great wealth to the society. No stigma was attached to the homosexual activity of the "nadle". Hill states that "sodomy with a nadle is countenanced by the culture and the insanity that is believed to follow such an act with a normal (sic) person does not occur if the relation is with the nadle" (Hill, 1935:276). This supports the idea that the "nadle" was thought to have sacred powers.

The berdache is a good example of how gender and sexuality are connected. In order to cross the sexuality boundary, one must also demonstrate that the gender boundary has been transcended. Masculinity is not in question in terms of the Mohave or Navaho cases because the berdache are not considered a member of the male or female gender. They are rather a member of both which allows them to express a wider range of sexuality. Others cultures not having a status of "both" rationalize sex and gender systems differently in regards to masculinity and homosexuality.

The use of homosexuality within the "active" older man, and "passive" youth model to reinforce "masculinity" can also be seen among the Sambians. Herdt (1981) describes the way in which young boys in that society first become fellators. He argued that, "Transitional homosexual fellatio contacts are a regular part of male development" (1981:252). Like Ancient Greece, the Sambians are a warrior society, and an extremely misogynist one. Physical separation by gender begins early and

women live in separate quarters from men. Male rituals and ceremonies are kept secret from women and possession of a flute is the physical representation of male power. Sambian men are thought to possess a limited amount of semen that women drain, like sexual vampires drain sexual intercourse. Semen is directly correlated with "masculinity", that is, if semen becomes depleted then a man will eventually dry up and shrivel away. Within this society, boys first become fellators. At puberty the boys roles are reversed and they become fellated. Homosexuality is allowed for a few years before the wife's menarche occurs and they begin coitus (most brides are around 12 to 15 years old) (Herdt, 1981:175); at which time males must stop all homosexual activity. A few men continue to engage in homosexual activities after marriage and fatherhood but they are disparaged for doing so (Herdt, 1981:252). However,

...they act only as inserters, not as fellators to younger boys-which is strictly forbidden, is immoral, and would be regarded as unspeakably unmanly (Herdt, 1981:252).

There is a distinction between "active" and "passive" homosexuality, anal coitus with men is not encouraged.

It is here we see the emphasis of physical and sexual domination, also characteristic of ancient Greece. This particular Sambian society is one of sharp contrast in regards to sexual differences, as was Greece (although Greece was probably somewhat less misogynist). Men's rituals represent women as inferiors who have the potential to rob them of their "masculinity". Herdt's assertion that "...the thrust of assertive masculinity stems partially from its tacit denials

that men have feminine qualities" (1981:161), is analogous to the conceptualization of masculinity within our own society where gender categories are seen as polar opposites. However, unlike Sambians, male members of our own society are not removed physically from women. In fact, most of their early childhood experiences and contact is spent in the presence of those they must attempt "not to be like" - their mothers (Hartley, 1959).

Unlike our society, homosexuality among men in Sambia and in Ancient Greece helped to reinforce masculinity by the total exclusion of women. Men learn to be men, inheriting particular privileges and "secret" ceremonies which reaffirm their status as members of the dominant group. Masculinity in Sambia is maintained through a pronounced separation which is dependent on the possession of a tangible item, the flute. Living in one hut or the other is a good way to demonstrate that one is male in that culture. In our own society, the components of masculinity are not so clear. Men and women live together. There is no tangible item to lay claim to which can prove that one is male, and therefore has more power, or has the right to more power. One can only be judged "masculine" by not being "feminine" (Hartley, 1959).

For a deeper analysis of "masculinity" among the Sambians and its connection with institutionalized homosexual practices, we borrow heavily from Herdt's own analysis. He states that since Sambia is a male cult and women are considered to be a necessary "evil" in terms of reproduction, "normal" young boys participate in homosexual practices in order to become men. Men then turn to women due to the need for

reproduction and cease homosexual activity.

In both cases, Ancient Greece and Sambia, several correlations are evident: (1) the sexual position one takes in homosexual practices is contained within a particular context, in these cases, related to age (i.e. young boys not yet considered "men" are passive, older "men" are "active"); (2) homosexuality promotes hegemonic masculinity in the sense that it is reinforced and transmitted through generations; and (3) both societies are warrior societies where "masculinity" involves a denial of "feminine" characteristics and an inferior view of women. Thus homosexual practices among men can be linked to sexism.

It should be noted however that Sambia and ancient Greece are not similar in regards to one important aspect; homosexuality among the Sambians was related to a mystical idea that women deplete semen. This idea was not present in ancient Greece.

However, since taking the passive role is reserved for younger inexperienced boys who have not yet been defined as men, it is acceptable to take a role in sexual activity which may be equated with gender inversion. The older man must take the aggressive position in sex thereby retaining his "masculine" status, that of aggression and dominance, two very important definitive characteristics of "being a man". In these cultures, men may propagate the "masculine" doctrine with the total exclusion of women whose value is purely reproductive. Further, men may then also be safely isolated from the devastating effects of contamination by women, whether that be by her menstrual blood or her "ability" to somehow

transfer her feminine characteristics to him.

Since Sambian women are seen as being able to drain a man of his semen, the men of San Blas in southeastern Spain see women as "serpents" (Brandes, 1981:222). There are some similarities between the men of San Blas and Sambia. Brandes found that women are thought to force men to engage in sexual activity which eventually kills them because semen is seen as precious and limited. Further, it is believed that the menstrual flow helps women to live longer because impurities are washed away. Therefore, menstrual blood is also considered polluted (Brandes, 1981:225).

The greatest fear of San Blas men is that after marriage their wives will dominate them, or they will be cuckolded (meaning to symbolically be "turned into a woman"). A common expression among the people of San Blas is to say that a wife has put horns on her husband. As Brandes states, "The horns, originally associated with or belonging to the woman, are placed upon the head of a man, thereby feminizing him (Brandes, 1981:229).

The men of San Blas believe that the locus of power and masculine behaviour lies within the genitals. Thus, the anus is connected to femininity. As Brandes states:

Men show themselves to be constantly aware that the anus can be used in homosexual encounters, in which case the passive partner is perceived as playing the feminine role, and indeed of being converted symbolically into a woman. It is this sexual transformation that men fear (Brandes, 1981:233).

Brandes further states that it is the passive form of homosexuality which is seen as feminine, not the active:

...men in San Blas, as throughout the Mediterranean are unafraid to joke about playing the phallic "male" part in homosexual intercourse. This role, at least, is consistent with masculine notions of genital assertion and aggression. It is rather the dread of assuming a feminine posture--of being the victim of sexual attack, instead of the perpetrator--that preoccupies the men of San Blas (Brandes, 1981:233-234).

Fear of passive homosexuality among San Blas men is further demonstrated by their objection to inserting suppositories into their anus. The male concern is that inserting objects into the anus may cause them to experience pleasure and thus they will be transformed into a homosexual, "or worse, one who is relegated to the female, passive role" (Prandes, 1981:233).

Unlike Sambian men, there is no institutionalized homosexuality. However, there is a concern with passive and active homosexuality. The men of San Blas connect passive homosexuality with "femininity", fearing that falling prey to it will transform them into what they fear most, "passive women".

Horowitz and Kaufman take a psychoanalytical approach to the passive/active split. In their analysis, masculinity is characterized as active whereas femininity is characterized as passive. Passivity for men is equated with castration, that is, in being like a woman and is intricately connected with masculine identity. They go on to state:

Homosexuality is equated with passivity and therefore with castration because in a patriarchal society men are by definition dominant; thus love for males comes to be equated with passivity. Passivity leads to anxiety about one's masculinity...(Horowitz and Kaufman in Kaufman, 1987:86-87).

In his discussion of the "macho" sub-culture of the

gay leather bars, Seymour Kleinberg argues that "macho cultures have always had more covert homosexuality". In those cultures, homosexuality is not a sexual identity, it is defined as a role.

Only the passive partner, which means anally passive or orally active, is homosexual; the other role is reserved for men because one either is a man or is not; that is, one is a woman, and a woman who cannot bear a child and attest to a man's virility is beneath contempt, at best a whore (Kleinberg as cited in Kaufman, 1987:131).

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF SEXUALITY UNDER CAPITALISM

Cross-cultural comparisons demonstrate that our assumptions about heterosexuality and homosexuality are part of a historically derived knowledge system. As socio-erotic identities, the categories of "homosexual" and "heterosexual", are created within one's culture, as are the categories of "male" and "female." It is important to be aware that the categories of male and female, heterosexual and homosexual do not exist in nature but are constructs, ways of giving meaning to particular patterns of sexual behaviour and interpersonal relationships. Because these categories are culturally defined, different patterns exist across history and between societies.

Gary Kinsman (1987:42-44) offers a socio-historical analysis of how gender and sexuality became interrelated in Canada at the onset of capitalism. Homosexuality developed a social identity which allowed for a distinction between "heterosexuality" and "homosexuality". Kinsman connects this development to increasing urbanization where gay sub-cultures

arose. According to Kinsman (1987:43):

With sexuality now being experienced as a separate realm, sexual identities needed their own justification. Reproductive sexuality, and eventually heterosexuality (although not specifically named as such), came to be defended by the Bourgeoisie and its agencies through an historical and social process integrating and transforming previous forms of sexual organization and regulation. The elite associated "heterosexuality" and respectable family life with social and moral order itself...in the capitalist epoch with the partial separation of gender division from the division of labour (sic) in the household economy, gender identities became more intensely polarized as they were combined with notions of sexual identity.

When homosexuality developed an identity, it became associated with gender and the condemnation of homosexuality among men served to strengthen the institution of patriarchal power. To Kinsman, "lust acquired a gender" when homosexuality arose as a collective. As the division of labour became more and more segregated, as men moved more and more into the public sphere, the contemporary heterosexual male became less often engaged in sexual activity which lead primarily to reproduction. He became a particular "type" of being with a particular erotic orientation which was associated with a heightened sense of masculine gender identification. As Kinsman argues (1987:44), homosexuality was rejected by the capitalist system because it did not fit with the vision of "masculinity" under capitalism. This vision was tied to the subordination of women, the insured continuation of the family as future workers, and the entrenching of patriarchy into the system . Kinsman states:

This emerging heterosexual identity is tied to the shifting social organization of gender and patriarchal relations. Male heterosexual identity is bound up with the institutionalization of a particular form of masculinity and is associated with the daily practices of men in the gender division of labour: a class organization of masculinity that

contains common features across class boundaries, shifting forms of family organization, the struggle for a family wage paid to the male bread winner, male responsibility for "his" wife and children, and male control over women's bodies and sexuality (Kinsman, 1987:44).

The idea that capitalism and heterosexuality are compatible within our society and thus can account for homophobia in some respect is echoed by Frank (1987:161):

Political economy seldom has taken seriously the question of just how is it that heterosexuality and masculinity are connected to the production and maintenance of the present system of power.

Frank goes on to suggest that many social scientists have ignored the problematics associated with hegemonic masculinity, including those on the left. Our society is so saturated with "maleness" in terms of knowledge, thought, and values, that much research is done from that perspective. Thus it is the very structure of hegemonic heterosexual masculinity which must be addressed.

Frank makes an important point here when he states that heterosexual hegemonic masculinity should be seen for what it is, a political issue and a form of social control, a "central organizing principle that supports present power arrangements" (Frank, 1987:166-167). Frank further states that:

Most males consciously or unconsciously consent to the dominant version of masculinity. Most males can be seen to undergo a process of transforming various meanings and messages to produce a constellation of behaviour, which we can call hegemonic heterosexual masculinity. Men become the embodiment of that socially created classification. They externalize this masculinity through their speech, their dress, their physical appearance and presence, and their relations with others (Frank, 1987:166).

Heterosexuality can be viewed as a central core of the social construction of masculinity in our society which is

associated with the concept of "activity" as opposed to "passivity". The passive male is associated with the homosexual male who in turn is perceived as not a "real man" but rather a "feminine" or "effeminate" one. An "active" man is a powerful man who has a great fear of losing that power, a power which is given on the fragile premise of biology. Weinberg (1973:3-4) a psycho-therapist recounted an experience he had in his office with a homophobic male client:

A fellow looked at a reproduction of Michelangelo's painting of Adam on the wall of my office, and turning away, told me he hated it." When he was asked why, he stated, "He's too passive. He's not doing anything".

Weinberg goes on to state that the homophobic male usually feels tremendous pressure to be the aggressor in sex, and he expects conformity and passivity on the part of "his" woman (Weinberg, 1973:3).

Although living as a lesbian in our society is not free of social condemnation, it receives much less attention than male homosexuality. The idea that lesbianism is not as "threatening" is related to the lack of "power" associated with women, and the lesser value placed on their role. It is not considered to be as serious an "infraction" to break with a less valued role than with a more valued one. The lack of attention paid to lesbianism makes the status of lesbianism itself almost invisible. There is an attempt to disregard the power of lesbian women, mainly due to the fact that we live in a patriarchal system. As Reynaud states (1985:54):

Homosexuality directly threatens man's power, as it excludes him when it is between women and when it is between men it represents the risk for him of being sexually appropriated. He is not inordinately put out by lesbianism, he often creates a reassuring image of it which pervades his fantasies...and when

he is tired of being a voyeur...he knows he can always retrieve his power through insult, derision or rape. On the other hand, the possibility of being used as a sexual object by a man causes him great anxiety.

MASCULINITY IN OUR SOCIETY

Within our society, it does not appear to be very clear what the proscriptions of "being a man" actually are. This lack of clarity is reflected in literature. In reviewing the literature concerning the conceptualization of masculinity from 1936 to the present, Joseph Pleck (1981:21) claims that American psychology has utilized the theory of male sex-role identity as the dominant paradigm for understanding the male experience. For individuals to become psychologically mature as members of their sex, "they must acquire male or female sex role identity". This "sex role identity" must be accompanied by "sex appropriate traits, attitudes, and interests that psychologically validate or affirm their biological sex" (Pleck, 1981:21). This conceptualization of gender has served to inform much of the well-known lines of research and theory on such issues as absence of father, male crime and violence, men's attitudes towards women and so forth. Pleck points out that this paradigm of sex role identity creates the conditions by which males are seen as either having "too little masculinity", as in effeminacy and homosexuality; or "too much masculinity", as in "hypermasculinity".

Pleck rationalizes that the "standards of being a man" can be seen as composing two themes. Those being that:

Men should cultivate an independent style of achievement, and they should cultivate incompetency in all feminine activities (Pleck, 1981:26).

Pleck draws on authors such as Turner, Komarovsky, and Hartley to support the claim that work conducted on masculinity has either tended to lean towards one or the other of these two themes. Hartley and Turner are offered as examples of researchers who provide support for the idea that the anti-femininity standard was the more dominant social norm governing the male role. Others such as Komarosky argue that achievement orientation was the more pervasive governing force of masculinity.

It is not an easy task to define masculinity because as David and Brannon argue, "being a man" in our culture is "not very specific" and can take a variety of "routes".

...The male role is demanding but, except on a few points, not very specific. There seems to be several basic routes, and many specific variations to fulfilling the minimum demands of the role. A man can choose what to "specialize" in--how to project a viable masculine image, choosing from among the options the role provides. In choosing, he is likely to be influenced by his age, class, ethnic subgroup, and physique, as well as individual talents and capacities (1976:11).

Drawing upon a multitude of sources, including studies done on masculinity from the sociological and the psychological perspectives, and the depictions of males in films and books; David and Brannon identify what they believe to be four basic themes or categories of the male gender role. Each is meant to be general and contain subparts and complexities which at some point overlap. David and Brannon emphasize that these general themes actually "overstate what is definitely known about sex roles" (David and Brannon, 1976:12). However, the conceptualization is useful in terms of getting closer to an understanding of what it means to be a male in North American

society. These four themes consist of the following:

- (1) NO SISSY STUFF: THE STIGMA OF ALL STEREOTYPED FEMININE CHARACTERISTICS AND QUALITIES, INCLUDING OPENNESS AND VULNERABILITY.
- (2) THE BIG WHEEL: SUCCESS, STATUS, AND THE NEED TO BE LOOKED UP TO.
- (3) THE STURDY OAK: A MANLY AIR OF TOUGHNESS, CONFIDENCE, AND SELF-RELIANCE.
- (4) GIVE'EM HELL: THE AURA OF AGGRESSION, VIOLENCE, AND DARING (DAVID AND BRANNON, 1976:12).

According to the first theme, which is the most important from the perspective of this work, a "real man" must never under any circumstances resemble women, or display strongly stereotyped feminine characteristics. Depending on the socio-cultural characteristics which David and Brannon mention, men will aspire to one of the latter three themes, or perhaps a combination of all three. These images are reflected in film and in everyday life. The executive in the three piece suit, the reliable family man who provides for his family, and the General Pattons, are all images that our culture recognizes as "masculine". What these characters share in common is "maleness". The executives, the generals, the bar room brawlers, the playboys, and so forth are all seen as "masculine".

It is these images of masculinity which our culture admires: the "James Deans" who rebel against authority with a careless regard for life, or the "Perry Masons" who through intelligence and integrity bring the criminal to justice in the end. Then there are the "Don Juans" who sleep with more women

then they can remember but never feel anything for anyone of them, or the ruthless and fearless leader who slaughters and defeats his enemies without sadness or pain. What we notice about these characters is that they are aggressive, fearless, unemotional, strong, and sexually potent. They are solitary, and most of all they are all that women are not supposed to be. As David and Brannon conclude:

This hypothetical man never feels anxious, depressed, or vulnerable, has never known the taste of tears. He is looked up to by all who know him, is a tower of strength both physically and emotionally, and exudes an unshakable confidence and determination that sets him apart from lesser beings. He's also aggressive, forceful, and daring, a barely controlled volcano of primal force (1976:35-36).

These men are "real men" because they are not like women who are thought to be emotional and passive, weak and sexually frigid. Women need to lean on someone, they are not solitary figures who ride off in the night to defeat armies, nor are they aggressive lawyers who fight to bring the elusive criminal to justice.

An elaborate study conducted by Broverman et al. in 1972, demonstrates that what it means to be "masculine" or "feminine" constitutes widely held beliefs in North America. In the study, Broverman et al. asked American respondents to indicate the extent to which 122 phrases on an adjectival checklist characterized an adult man and woman. The checklist gave bipolar traits such as "NOT AT ALL AGGRESSIVE - VERY AGGRESSIVE", "NOT AT ALL EMOTIONAL-VERY EMOTIONAL", "NOT AT ALL AMBITIOUS-VERY AMBITIOUS". If 75% or more of the sample, for example, agreed that "VERY AGGRESSIVE" was more descriptive of an average man than an average woman, that item was defined as

stereotypical.

Two cluster samples were collected, one entitled "COMPETENCY-CLUSTER" and the other deemed "WARMTH-EXPRESSIVE CLUSTER". The results worth noting are as follows: gender role stereotypes fall into a feminine warmth-expressive cluster and a masculine competency cluster. The competency cluster included traits such as being independent, active, competitive, and ambitious. A relative absence of these traits characterized women. That is, relative to men, women were seen to be dependent, passive, non-competitive and so on. The warmth-expressive cluster inversely consisted of attributes such as gentle, quiet, and sensitive to the feelings of others. Relative to women, men were seen as lacking these traits. In addition, Broverman et al. found that masculine traits were valued more highly than feminine traits.

The findings of Broverman et al. indicate that respondents believed males were lacking in traits which females were thought to possess, and females were lacking in the traits which males were thought to possess. Further, these findings may be interpreted as constituting the belief that males and females either should, or do, embody not only specific but opposite traits. Since over 75% of the sample agreed on these characteristics, it may be concluded that the conceptualizing of these gender traits may well be deeply engrained in our society's concept of "masculinity" and "femininity".

Aubrey P. Andelin wrote a book in 1972 which sheds some light on the kinds of characteristics men in North America "should" possess in order to be "real men". Although no

empirical data is used to support his claims, his book serves as a good source of information on how North Americans conceptualize the male gender role. Andelin begins his introduction with the sentence: "This is a book which teaches men to be men" (1972:12).

It becomes apparent very early in Andelin's book that he is disturbed by changing gender roles. He expresses a concern that:

There are men everywhere who fail to take their position as head of household, who allow women and children to push them around, not wishing to accept the responsibility which is rightfully their own (Andelin, 1972:11).

He warns of the "social problems" created by what he terms a "lack of manliness" (Andelin, 1972:12). Among those are the creation of the "dominant mother", the distraction of women from their real duties of "wife and mother", the insecurity women will experience if men do not dominate them, "working wives who neglect their duties", and "homosexuality" caused by the lack of a role model. Andelin concludes that the latter "causes a blurring of sex roles".

The following quote clearly demonstrates Andelin's position that men have not only great privilege in "masculinity", but great responsibility. A lack of "manliness" can cause many problems for society as well as for subsequent generations. Andelin states of the "un-masculine" father:

Both boys and girls fail to find a definite sex image with which to identify. Because of this, the girls fail to grow strongly feminine and the boys fail to grow strongly masculine, further contributing to the tendency of "unisex". If men are truly men and women are truly women, this contrast will keep the sexes attracted to one another and reduce the tendency to the unwholesome and destructive perversion of homosexuality (Andelin, 1976:13).

As Andelin explains what he feels are the consequences of a lack of masculinity, he also does not hesitate to elaborate on what qualities he believes are "masculine" ones. The "ideal man", according to Andelin, combines the qualities of both "velvet and steel" which are "properly blended" and thus result in "a masterpiece of creation and the greatest contribution to the well-being of society" (Andelin, 1976:20). He goes on to say:

The ideal man has the strength, endurance, and temperance of fine steel. He is a composite of many sterling qualities. Foremost among them is his willingness to assume masculine burdens, to earn his bread by the sweat of his face, and thus properly provide for himself and family...He delights in the opportunity to prove his manhood... he is happy to shoulder obligations...for the feeling of manliness it gives him...the man of steel is a masculine man. He is aggressive, determined, decisive, and independent (Andelin, 1976: 17-18).

Finally, we see that the "ideal man" is an "unbendable piece of steel", and possesses "qualities of masculinity" which according to the author "set him apart from women and children and weaker members of his own sex" (Andelin, 1976:19). The qualities of "velvet", Andelin suggests, take the rough edges off the "steel" qualities. Andelin describes it best when he states:

When the velvet qualities are added, a masterpiece results. That firmness which otherwise might appear harsh is softened. It is not unlike the large, heavy hands which have been trained to play the violin. Such hands carry the raw strength to crush the instrument in a moment, but there is no danger of such a thing, as the gentle strokes used in bringing forth the beautiful music demonstrate a softness and appreciation for the artistic (Andelin, 1976:20).

The picture Andelin paints of "masculinity" is one

which grants men great privilege and great responsibility at the same time. Men are expected to shoulder all obligation for their families' welfare because, they are the strongest member, as well as the supreme ruler of it. Men are told to rule with an "iron hand" and curtail the "working women" who neglect their roles as wife and mother.

Andelin bases his proscriptions of masculinity on the idea that "masculinity" and "femininity" are "natural" and are grounded in biology. However, there is a basic contradiction in his philosophy because he infers that men are not living up to their "rightful" place as the ruler of the home. Thus, what to Andelin is "natural" also requires policing in some way. Women must be "dominated" to stay within what Andelin sees as their "natural" place, and men should "review the rules" of their obligations as men in this society. So the right to dominate might be "natural" to the author, but it also must be earned by proving ones "manhood". Further, Andelin speaks of "social ills" which can result when men do not embody the perfect blend of what he terms "velvet and steel". Andelin advocates severe gender role rigidity. Men must act like "men", thus dominate women, and hate and fear homosexuality. The "blurring of sex roles" is one of the "social ills" of society according to the author. Social ills such as women battering, and violent crime, however, are not addressed in Andelin's book.

There is a measurable difference in the amount of violent crime which is committed by men in comparison with women. In 1987, 218 652 crimes of violence were reported in Canada. Of those, adult males committed 77 986 (36%) of them compared with 8 504 (4%) committed by adult females. The

preponderance of committed violent crimes begins early for males. As Lamar Empey concluded in 1982, "both the prevalence and the incidence of delinquent behaviour are greater among boys than among girls" (p.123). There were 22 303 sexual assaults committed in Canada in 1987: 7276 (33%) by males, compared to 101 (0.4%) by females (Stats Canada:1987). Further, it is men who batter, sexually assault and murder women in our society. A recent article in the Montreal Gazette reported that in the province of Quebec alone in 1989, 30 women were murdered by their husbands or boyfriends. The most recent research shows that in 1985, 40% of murders in Canada had a direct link with conjugal violence, an increase of 10% since 1980. A therapist in Montreal stated that "men who murder their wives do so in a last desperate effort for control" (Gazette, Collister and Bagnall, 1990: B-5). By this we can see that men go to great lengths to live up to what they feel makes them distinctive as men.

Men act out aggressive behaviour more than women do in our society. Unless we aspire to the biological argument that men are genetically predisposed to be more aggressive, we are left with the notion that aggression is learned. Aggressive behaviour in some circumstances may well be expected of men. An excellent illustration is given by David Brannon in The Forty Nine-Percent Majority (1976:35) who tells the story of his father who came home drunk one night from a poker game:

My mother had locked him out. After knocking and banging around for awhile my father left in disgust. The misunderstanding was settled the next day, but in the midst of an argument some years later, I heard my mother say to my father: "Well, I'll say this: if you were a real man, you'd have chopped down my door..."

Men in our society should not only be aggressive, but should not feel pain. H. Goldberg (1976) states:

The destruction of the male body as a result of macho rigidity manifests itself in countless ways. Though men die from almost every major disease at a significantly higher rate than women, study after study indicates that women complain of significantly more symptoms and go to doctors more often. In effect, what this says is that men are significantly more out of touch with the body's warning signals (Goldberg, 1976:111).

Goldberg goes on to say that one cultural definition we have of being a "real man" involves the denial of feelings of pain. Be it a football game or a fight, men are taught very early in life that it is unmanly to be ill, to complain, or to ask for help (Goldberg, 1976:112).

Goldberg's argument offers an alternative explanation to the shorter life span of males. For example the average life span for men is 72 years compared with 79 years for women (STATS CANADA:1981). If Goldberg's explanation is supportable, women will not, as has been suggested, experience a shortened life span and equivalent cardiac problems by moving into traditionally male high powered positions.

Aside from aggressive behaviour and the denial of pain, men are also hesitant to participate in activities which have been traditionally seen as female. For example, Armstrong and Armstrong (1978:55) cite several studies conducted between 1971 and 1976 demonstrating that "...work in the home is essentially women's work". A study by Meissner et al. done in the mid 70's revealed that "most married women do the regular, necessary, and most time-consuming work in the household every day" (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1978:55). Further, a study of graduate students conducted by Hitchman during the same period

found that even in a highly educated population, "women still do the majority of housework and child care tasks" (cited in Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978:55). Further, Pleck stated that:

Men today are doing far more housework and spending more time with their children, yet the proportion of domestic time is still skewed heavily toward women (Pleck 1981:9).

Our society depicts women and men as polar opposites in that they play complementary roles which involve different tasks. The conceptualization of "opposites" is as directly observable in the labour force as it is in the home. Statistics Canada (1985:43) reported that in "1983, 77% of all female employees worked in just five occupational groups: clerical, service, sales, health, and teaching". Further, "the non-professional categories (clerical, service and sales) were the largest of the "female" occupational groups, accounting for 62% of all female workers". Men on the other hand tend to be concentrated in professions with higher pay and more prestige, such as engineering and law (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978:37).

The idea that traits associated with "masculinity" are given a higher value than those associated with "femininity" is supported by a number of studies. The respondents in Broverman's study were asked to rate the traits they typed as "masculine" or "feminine" in terms of desirability. Broverman found that the traits respondents typed as being more typical of males were also seen as more admirable than those traits which respondents attributed to females. Respondents of both genders found masculinity to be more socially desirable than femininity (Broverman et al., 1972).

After scrutinizing cross-cultural studies on the

sexual division of labour, Mackie (1983:60) concluded that "no matter what specific activities men and women engage in, society values the roles played by men more than those played by women". Mead (1935) concluded through her studies of several societies that a higher prestige is always attached to men regardless of the kinds of tasks men do. Further, she found that this higher prestige is awarded men cross-culturally. For example, of the three societies Mead studied in New Guinea, the Tchambuli were the least like our own society in terms of gender roles. Although patrilineal, women were responsible for the economic activity of subsistence while men concerned themselves with arts and ceremony (Mead, 1935:186). However, the Tchambuli culture placed great emphasis on art, so even though women had greater power, the higher prestige was awarded to men who were directly involved with such activities as adorning themselves and dancing.

The idea that the tasks men do are awarded higher value simply because they are deemed "male" can be seen in our own society. For example, we know that men's labour power carries a higher monetary value than women's. In the home, women's labour carries no monetary value. In the public sphere, in 1982, the average earnings of women who were employed full time were just 64% of those of full time male employees: \$16,100 compared with \$25,100 for men" (STATISTICS CANADA, 1985:46). Further, when an occupation which has been traditionally male dominated, as in the case of clerical work in the nineteenth century, becoming "feminized", its value in terms of prestige and wages decreases (Lowe, 1987).

Since "femininity" is less valued than "masculinity"

in our society, it follows that female dominated areas, be it in the labour force or in the home, would also carry less value. Thus, men are not encouraged to strive towards emulating women because to do so would involve a drop in status. Since women start at a lower vantage point than men simply by virtue of their sex, women gain in status by crossing the gender boundary. That is, when women enter traditionally male dominated spheres, it is acknowledged that they are making a step upward. Since men already are advantaged in terms of their sex, to enter female dominated spheres or engage in behaviours seen as "feminine" involves a drop in status.

We can find many examples of women who have crossed the division of labour boundary (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978:18-19). Some of the most apparent examples of this can be seen during times of war. For example, after 1915 in Canada when thousands of young males were recruited into the armed forces, women were called upon to take a larger role in agricultural production. In the province of Ontario alone, between the years of 1917 and 1918, over 2000 women who were organized into farm labour brigades:

packed and picked fruit, handled the horses, pitched hay, drove motor trucks to market to sell the fruit...worked in canning factories...and hoed for ten hours a day (Prentice et al., 1988:139)

Again, during the Second World War, women were called upon to fill the jobs left vacant by the men who went off to fight. Although earning less wages than men, women worked on farms and in factories. According to Dumont et al. (1987:282), in the province of Quebec around 1942 "a few women were trained to be mechanics, electricians and welders in war factories". Despite

health hazards and dangerous working conditions, the war factories attracted women in large numbers (Dumont et al., 1987:282). After the war, the federal government developed ways to coax women back into the home, in order to return the men to their "rightful" place in the public sphere. Among some of the initiatives introduced were the family allowance which was made payable to women, and the closing down of day care centres which had been set up during the war (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978:19).

Except for periods of crisis, as in the case of the First and Second World Wars in Canada, the status quo in terms of division of labour by sex has remained intact since the 1900s (Kapp Howe, 1977:6). According to Kapp Howe:

... a number of different scholars have now determined that the rate of occupational segregation by sex is exactly as great today as it was at the turn of the century. Only the jobs, not the proportions, seem to have really changed...
(Kapp Howe, 1977:6).

Kapp Howe argues that "in 1900, the most common occupation for an American woman was unpaid labour in the home". In spite of the increase of women in the labour force, "this is still true today". Further, citing such authors as Edward Gross and Francine Blau Weisskoff who have done extensive research on women and labour in history, Kapp Howe concludes that:

In 1900 most members of the female labour force could be found in agriculture, manufacturing, or domestic service jobs. Today nearly two-thirds can be found in clerical, service, or sales jobs" (Kapp Howe, 1976:6).

Women have historically been prevented by convention but even by law, from engaging in or "invading" sectors of the labour

market designated for men. For example, in Quebec, women were not permitted to practise law until 1941 (Dumont, 1987:220), keeping that profession exclusive to men. There has been, on the other hand, no such laws or legislation enacted to prevent men from staying at home with their children or working in jobs which are female dominated. For example, men have not flocked into nursing or secretarial school. In 1986, women earned 100% of the secretarial degrees in Canada, and 98% of all nursing degrees (Statistics Canada, 1985:35). Rather than ask why women are still entering these areas, why not ask why men are not. Legislation has not been required to prevent men from entering "female" dominated jobs because these jobs are generally characterised by low wages and little prestige. What is more important, however, is the fact that "female" designated work is devalued in our society because "femaleness" in general is devalued. The jobs women do, including housework, are considered to have too low a status for men to engage in. If we return to Lowe's example of the feminization of clerical work, it is clear that it is not merely the work in itself which determines the amount of value placed on it, but rather which gender category is associated with it (Lowe, 1987).

Ideological justification has been used to depict women as being better suited for the private sphere of motherhood and domesticity which has helped greatly in preserving men's "rightful" place in the public sphere. Even though tasks which have been deemed "female" carry less value and would involve a drop in status for the male individual who would engage in them, this alone is not sufficient to justify why men don't participate in tasks typed as "female". The more

pervasive answer is related to our society's devaluation of women and the function of homosexuality among men.

MASCULINITY AND HETEROSEXUALITY

Even though there are no concrete barriers to prevent men from entering female dominated jobs, this research posits that there is a very strong ideological one which relates to the function homosexuality plays in the social control of masculinity. The connection between the accusation of homosexuality among men and deviation from socially sanctioned "masculine" behaviour is not self-evident. The connection is associated with the belief that gay men act like women. Morin and Garfinkle (1978:40) state that:

It is commonly believed that gay men do not fit the cultural criteria for masculinity, and being gay is strongly associated with violation of sex role stereotypes in American society.

They further argue that:

Homophobia appears to be functional in the dynamics of maintaining the traditional male role. The fear of being labelled homosexual serves to keep men within the confines of what the culture defines as sex role appropriate behaviour (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978:41).

Heterosexuality is central to the culturally constructed view of masculinity in our society. To make the claim, as this work does, that hatred and fear of homosexuals (esp. gay males) is a very effective variable in the maintenance of gender rigidity in males, requires seeing heterosexuality as crucial to the masculine identity. To Gregory Herek:

Although personal conceptions of masculine identity in contemporary America vary according to race, class, age, and other social variables, there remains a stable common core, which I have called heterosexual masculinity (cited in Kimmel, 1987:72).

Because heterosexuality is considered to be a crucial component in the social construction of masculinity in our society, gay men are thought to be like women.

Some researchers, like Saghir and Robins (1970), set out to test the assumption that gay men were like women. They concluded that only about 15% of gay males appear "effeminate". We are given no idea, however, how the results were obtained, or how Saghir and Robins actually defined "effeminate". Aside from the issue of why this kind of research question is posed at all, this type of study may have little value for several reasons. First "effeminacy", usually defined as being some form of exaggerated femininity, is an extremely subjective term which is highly interpretive. Secondly, since all male homosexuals are not known, it can not be concluded whether they are "effeminate", "feminine", or otherwise. Finally, and most importantly, it is redundant to ask a question for which the response is already known. If most or all homosexual men acted in some way which could be identified as "feminine" by our society's definition of it, we would immediately know who was gay and who was not. Further, the posing of a question which attempts to disprove that gay men are "feminine" not only reinforces the devaluation of "femininity" in our society, but is homophobic in its very articulation.

The gender inversion myth is a widespread one within North America. In his article, "Homophobia Among Men" (1975), Lehne cites the study by Levitt and Klassen in 1973 of 3,000 American adults which found that 69% of respondents believed that homosexual men acted like the opposite sex. Levitt and Klassen also reported in this same study that over 37% of the

American public believed that it was easy to tell if a man was homosexual because he would be similar to a women in appearance as well as in psychological functioning. Morin and Garfinkle (1978) who have done an extensive literature review on attitudes towards homosexuality cite several studies to support the idea that gay men are often believed to look and act like women. For example, a survey conducted by Tavris for Psychology Today magazine in 1977 on masculinity included questions pertaining to homosexuality. Morin and Garfinkle (1978:36) reported that:

Although the study was based on an unusually large sample, it should be noted that the respondents were markedly younger, more affluent, less religious, better educated, and more liberal than the average American. Despite this liberal bias, 70% of the heterosexual respondents (both male and female) reported believing that "homosexual men were not wholly masculine."

A further study cited by Morin and Garfinkle (1978) which revealed that gay men are not only seen as "feminine" but are viewed more negatively than heterosexual men was conducted by Karr in 1975. Karr asked a sample of 100 men to evaluate homosexual males and heterosexual males on various characteristics on a scale. Karr's findings reveal that male respondents rated the "typical homosexual" on an evaluative factor as less good, less honest, less fair, less valuable, less stable, less intellectual, less friendly, less clean, as well as more shallow and unhealthy than the "typical male heterosexual". On a masculine factor, the gay man was rated as more delicate, more passive, more womanly, smaller, softer, and more yielding than a heterosexual man.

Karr's study is problematic in that there were only

male respondents and no indication of whether or not these respondents would have been any more favourable to lesbians than to gay males. Although Karr demonstrates that men are homophobic, and even that men are "heterosexist", (that is, they believe in the superiority of their own sexual orientation); there is no support that men are more homophobic because Karr's study did not include lesbians as a target group.

In reviewing the literature which supports the idea that there is widespread belief that gay men are like women, Siegel (1981:148) concluded that:

The norm for straight men is to be masculine, while the norm for gay men is to be feminine. Deviation from either norm leads to devaluation.

Siegel also notes that homosexuality became a bona fide heading in the Psychological Abstracts relatively recently: only a decade ago readers were cross-referred to Sexual Inversion (Siegel, 1981:147).

We can account for the widespread belief that gay men are "feminine" if we consider how that myth functions to ease the discomfort men feel in our society at the thought that they could be homosexual. Much evidence exists which demonstrates that men are most threatened by the gay man that appears "masculine".

Paul Siegel (1981) seeks to explain the findings that gays who are perceived as similar to what a "real" man is supposed to be like, produce the most homophobic responses. He cites a study which was conducted by Michael Storms at the University of Kansas. Storms provided his subjects with a brief paragraph describing a college aged peer which the subjects (both male and female), were asked to indicate whether they

liked or did not like. This hypothetical student named "John" was sometimes described as having stereotyped feminine interests, attitudes and behaviour. For example, he majored in fashion design, liked to dance, wore flowered shirts, high heeled shoes, and tight fitting European jeans. At other times "John" was described as having stereotyped "masculine" interests, attitudes, etc...in that he majored in business, played sports, and so forth. Some forms stated that "John" had the "average number of sexual encounters", all of which were heterosexual, some forms substituted the word, homosexual. This sexual orientation reference cross cut "John's" gender attributes. Storms found that his "macho" gay male John was far more distrusted than was his "swishy" gay male counterpart. Siegel interpreted Storms results in the following way:

If I, as a heterosexual male who views himself as fairly traditionally masculine, am presented with a highly effeminate (dissimilar) gay male, I can minimize my sex role confusion by reflecting: "Here is a man who will never enjoy male privilege because he acts like a woman. He clearly never had a choice in the matter. Thus I need only pity him...In contrast, if I am forced to perceive a gay man as highly similar to myself, especially in terms of masculinity, I will have some problems. Here is someone who can "pass", thus enjoying all the benefits of being male. But he has apparently chosen to give it all away. This perception forces me to reassess my assumptions (Siegel, 1981:284).

Thus, because heterosexuality is so intricately connected to the "masculine" identity, homosexual men must be seen as "feminine". As femininity is devalued in our society, then so is the male homosexual. Further, to conceptualize the gay male as not "masculine" reduces his status to that of a woman, therefore making him appear less threatening. Because it is "passivity" which is most distrusted in men, the homosexual

male is considered to be "female". This rationalization brings us back to the idea once again that men in our society are taught to suppress all traces of what can be seen as "feminine". This avoidance and devaluation of "femininity" is inherent in the way boys learn "not to be" female.

LEARNING HOW "NOT TO BE" FEMALE

Since gay men are thought to act like women, that is, are seen as gender role "deviates", it is important to consider that boys learn to be men primarily through learning not to be women. Because women are held up as the example of what "not to be like", socialization in regards to masculinity is taught more in relation to avoidance of behaviour rather than by imitation. Thus, as gay men are thought to embody the characteristics of women, it holds that this image would be regarded with hostility and fear as well as a tangible threat of what they have been taught to fear most of all, femininity.

Berger and Luckmann argue that primary socialization takes place in a highly emotive atmosphere where the child possesses virtually no power:

In primary socialisation there is not a problem with identification. There is no choice of significant others. Society presents the candidate for socialisation with a predefined set of significant others whom he must accept as such with no possibility of opting for another arrangement...since the child has no choice in the selection of his (sic) significant others, his (sic) identification with them is quasi automatic. For the same reason, his internalisation of their particular reality is quasi inevitable (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:154).

Although we can agree with Berger and Luckmann's assessment, it is important to note that there are differences which exist between male and female gender socialization. For

example, research conducted by Hartley indicated that for boys, "the desired behaviour is rarely defined positively...but undesirable behaviour is indicated negatively" (1959:7). Hartley's study involved interviewing boys and girls between the ages of eight to ten years. The children were asked questions pertaining to their expectations of gender role behaviour. Hartley found that boys must either stumble on the right gender path or bear repeated punishment, without warning, when they accidentally enter the wrong one. Since "masculine" behaviour is not clearly defined to them, boys experience great anxiety that they will do something which will make them appear "feminine". Often this anxiety is increased by the lack of direct role modelling, as in the case of the absent father. Many children in the study confessed that, "I don't see my father often"...or... "Its harder to know about boys than girls"..."father hardly has time to talk to me" and so forth (Hartley, 1959:8). Further, the mother often becomes the central figure in the child's life. For girls, this means that gender identification is based on modelling, for boys it indicates that he is presented with, and must learn from the very ideal of what he is not supposed to be. As Hartley concluded:

On one hand, we have insisted that boys eschew all "womanly" things almost from the cradle, and enforced these demands in a way that makes whatever is female a threat to him -- for that is what he must not be. Ordinarily, one responds to a threat by trying to escape from it or by trying to destroy the threatening object. But this the boy cannot do, for society puts him directly under the jurisdiction of women, without relief, for most of his waking day (Hartley, 1959:9).

Thus, males remain more anxious about gender throughout life and are more hostile towards the other gender, as well as

towards homosexuals than are females.

Hartley's findings in 1959 have been reiterated by others. Mackie (1983:115) claims that many social scientists agree that gender socialisation demands more from boys than girls, and that this gender identity is less secure for males. Mackie cites the findings of research conducted by David Lynn in 1959 and 1969, who postulated that because of the greater availability of the mother and the relative absence of the father during early childhood, little girls more easily develop their gender identity, through direct imitation and positive reinforcement. Mackie further cites Chodorow, who in 1971 concluded that girls are allowed more gender freedom than boys. Because femininity is less valued, young girls are allowed to dress and act like boys without having their femininity questioned. Ultimately then, more pressure is placed on boys to act "like boys" than for girls to act "like girls" (Mackie, 1983:115).

A good illustration of how some males attempt to avoid "feminisation" and its correlation with homosexuality is offered by Hoch (1979), in the example of working class boys he takes from Komarovsky's Blue Collar Marriage. Hoch begins with the rationalization that, "...the extreme machismo of working class gangs is readily understandable, since quite often their "masculinity" is the only source of strength the society allows them..." (Hoch, 1979:85). Further, these working class boys segregate themselves into a whole "male culture" involving pool rooms and locker rooms, taverns, armies and motorcycle gangs, and thus they expose themselves more and more to all male relationships and the possibility of homosexual involvement.

Hoch attributes the high level of violence among these boys to the struggle against effeminacy. In Hoch's words:

The more one retreats to an all-male environment, presumably the greater the homosexual temptation, and hence the continued need to "up the ante" in the way of violence to prove one's manhood. Particularly favoured are assaults against those tainted with a 'softer' version of manhood-for example, as in queer bashing...(Hoch, 1979:85)

The struggle against appearing "feminine", and the correlation of homosexuality in men with femininity are likely to facilitate higher levels of homophobia and sexism.

HOMOSEXISM IN MEN

Studies show that men are not only more homophobic than women, they are more sexist. That is, men tend to be more hostile towards male homosexuals than towards lesbians. The higher degree of hostility males hold towards gay men has been attributed to the perception of gay men as gender role violators. In a study by Millham, San Miguel, and Kellogg (1976); a sample of 795 introductory psychology students were presented with a 76 item homosexuality attitude scale. The data was analyzed separately for opinions concerning male and female homosexual targets. In general, their findings revealed that lesbians were seen as more preferable to male homosexuals and male subjects scored significantly higher than female subjects for their preference for lesbians over homosexual men. Subjects expressed significantly higher personal anxiety with respect to same sexed homosexuals than to opposite sexed homosexuals.

These findings can be interpreted in light of the argument that lesbians are seen as taking a step up in status where as gay men are seen as taking a step down. Since gay males are seen as being "feminine", lesbians are also seen as "masculine". Siegel (1979:283) concluded of these kinds of findings that:

If gays are seen as "cross sexed typed" then lesbians are perceived as being trying to be like men. And this should be excusable...at least they are erring in the right direction.

The idea that men are more homophobic as well as more homosexist is articulated by Morin and Garfinkle (1978:38):

Although homophobia is found in both women and men, it appears to be more exaggerated and more powerful in males than in females.

They point out that several other similar studies which have been conducted on gender differences in anti-homosexual attitudes reached the same conclusions, like those conducted by Brown and Amoroso, 1975; and Gallup, in 1977. One important attitudinal study singled out by Morin and Garfinkle was conducted by Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier in 1974. According to Morin and Garfinkle, Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier "emphasized the male homosexual's violation of the male role as a crucial element in the finding that men hold more negative attitudes towards homosexuals than women" (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978:39). Steffensmeier et al. are cited by Morin and Garfinkle as concluding that:

Male subjects are significantly more rejecting of homosexuals than are females, and that male subjects are especially rejecting of male, as compared to female homosexuals (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978:39).

Morin and Garfinkle cite a study done in 1977 by Morin

which attempted to test the hypothesis that same-gender interaction is crucial to the presence of negative attitudes towards homosexuals using chair placement as a measure of social distance. Subjects were asked to participate in an interview and were unaware that they were being studied. Male respondents were placed in a room with a male interviewer who was labelled homosexual, and female respondents were placed in a room with a lesbian labelled interviewer. Morin found that male participants reacted with approximately three times more social distance, when being interviewed by a homosexually labelled male experimenter than did females who were being interviewed by a lesbian labelled female experimenter (Morin and Garfinkle: 1978). Although interesting, Morin neglected to test the respondents reaction to "cross-sex" homosexuals so we are left with the conclusion that men do not like gay males more than women do not like lesbians.

Gregory Herek's evaluative of studies which have compared the attitudes of men and women to homosexuality, concluded that males and females probably hold roughly similar positions on general questions of morality and civil liberties, but males are more homophobic in their emotional reaction to homosexuality (Herek, in Kimmel, 1987:70). Herek further correlates homophobia with traditional views of gender and family roles. According to Herek, the stereotype that gay people violate the demands of gender roles (in that gay men are perceived as effeminate and lesbians as masculine) is related to the hostility directed towards them (Herek, in Kimmel, 1987:70). Herek further states that:

...Heterosexual men have more negative reactions to gay people than do women, on the average, because such hostility is inherent in the cultural construction of the heterosexual male role and identity; this is less true for heterosexual female role and identity. This process works at a social level, where heterosexual males are pressured by peers and societal standards to conform to certain behavioral patterns, and at a psychological level, where heterosexual males internalize those standards and experience anxiety that they will fail to measure up to their role... conformity to social standards and defense against anxiety push heterosexual men to express homophobic attitudes and provide rewards in the form of social support and reduced anxiety...in other words, heterosexual men reaffirm their male identity by attacking gay men (Herek as cited in Kimmel, 1987:71-72).

There is no known study which has looked specifically at how homosexism and gender role rigidity are related in terms of masculinity. However, a few studies have been devoted to exploring the relationship between support for traditional gender role behaviour and how this is correlated with homophobia. Paul Siegel (1979) cites the work of Games and MacDonald who found a correlation between gender role rigidity and homophobia using factor analysis. Macdonald and Games divided the concept of gender role rigidity into four component dimensions, which they defined as a need to maintain traditional distinctions between masculinity and femininity. These four dimensions consisted of: equality in the professions; personal habits; social-domestic work; and power in the home. Siegel sums up the findings of Macdonald and Games by explaining that "sex role rigidity is a form of sexism, a manifestation of the view that masculinity is better, and more deserving of reward than is femininity" (Siegel, 1979:283). Futher, Siegel states that:

There is a psychological relationship between sex role rigidity and homophobia. The link that ties the two concepts together is the mistaken belief that gender identification and sexual orientation are related (Siegel, 1978:283).

Another study which supports the idea that gender rigid individuals tend to be homophobic was conducted by Dunbar et al. in 1973. One hundred and twenty Canadian males were asked to complete a series of specially designed attitude scales which pertained to homosexuality, personal sex guilt, and sex stereotyping. Dunbar and his associates found that homophobic men also tended to "hold a more constricted view of male appropriate behaviours than less homophobic respondents", and also to "perceive any male exhibiting what are thought of as feminine characteristics as being suspect of homosexual tendencies" (Dunbar et al., 1973:273). The results of this study give support to the idea Siegel (1978) proposed concerning the psychological connection between gender and sexual orientation.

The idea that "masculinity" takes heterosexuality as its core is an important one. It is where we can make the link between the social construction of masculinity (gender) and homosexism (sexuality). If masculinity is indeed constructed from an avoidance of "femininity", and heterosexuality is the central core of that construction, then the perception of gay men as "gender inverts" and homosexism as a form of social control becomes theoretically clearer.

The way in which homosexism functions to keep men within the traditional boundaries of masculine behaviour (or in other words, to reinforce gender rigid behaviour) is argued

well by Lehne (1975:71). Lehne hypothesizes that "for homophobia to exist as a threat then it is necessary that the associated stereotypes of homosexuality be false". In other words, if male homosexuals were a "visible" group and the stereotypes about them were factual, then the accusation of "what are you, a fag?" would make little sense except in the context of the social control of masculinity. If we know what a gay male looks like; if he is always recognizable then there is little possibility that a heterosexual male would ever have to worry about being called "a queer" or a "fag". Lehne concludes that:

Homophobia is used as a technique of social control by homophobic individuals to enforce the norms of male role behaviour. This is why individuals whose lives are generally unaffected by homosexuality are homophobic. Homosexuality is not the real threat, the real threat is change in the male sex role (Lehne, 1975:71).

Men in our society acquire "masculinity" by learning to devalue and despise "femininity". The devaluation of "femininity" provides some of the justification for hegemonic masculinity which allows for the domination of women by men. Because "masculinity" is a more valued role overall than femininity, a greater stigma is inflicted when men violate traditional gender role expectations. Because heterosexuality is at the central core of the social construction of masculinity, homosexuality in males is related to gender inversion. Due to the assumption that gay males are highly visible and that any male that looks or acts in a manner which may be seen as feminine can be labelled homosexual, homophobia functions as a form of social control. Men in general do not wish to attract a label which is highly stigmatized in our

society, thus they are more vigilant than females in keeping within the boundaries of socially acceptable gender behaviour. Interestingly, homosexism and its function involves at the same time, the propagation of a myth (i.e., all gay men act like women) and on the other hand denies that myth in its actual practice (any man runs the "risk" of being labelled homosexual if he exhibits behaviour or mannerisms perceived as feminine). Gender role rigidity in males, is in part the result of anxiety about appearing "feminine", which due to the mistaken correlation between one's gender and one's sexual orientation, becomes translated into being labelled a homosexual.

Studies have shown that males are more homophobic than females and that males tend to be more homophobic. Very few studies however, have explored the relationship between gender role rigidity and homosexism. The next chapters present data from a study of University students (15 males and 15 females) that examines the link between gender role rigidity and homosexism. The hypothesis that men will be more homophobic and gender role rigid than females is explored in the analysis of 30 in depth interviews. More important is the investigation of some of the theoretical rationales for homosexism, as it relates to gender role expectations, such as attribution of "opposite" gender traits to gay men and lesbians, basic stereotypes, as well as an evaluation of gender attitudes and behaviours. The research goal was to reach some conclusions about the relationship between homosexism and gender role rigidity in regards to the social control of masculinity.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the method employed to investigate the proposed relationship between gender role rigidity, homophobia/homosexism, as well as other related variables. The sampling procedure, the goals of the research design in regards to the development of variable measures, and the development of an index will also be introduced.

The relationship posited between gender role rigidity and homosexuality is a new one and is not empirically known. I am operating on the assumptions of previous research which suggested that men are more gender rigid, and homosexual than women. However, the goal of this research was to go beyond their assumptions. The theory proposes that men will be more gender rigid and homosexual than women. Various questions were formulated to test these assumptions, but the underlying goal was to explore some of the themes connected to gender role rigidity and homosexuality, and compare them in terms of gender. For example, if gay men are seen as "feminine" or "effeminate" how are gay men defined? What adjectives do individuals use to describe gay men, are gay men thought to be like women in appearance or does the comparison extend beyond the physical perhaps to the emotional or psychological? Do individuals attribute cross-sexed mannerisms to lesbians, and if so, is the stereotype as clear as it is for gay men? Given that men are more gender rigid, in what way is this gender role rigidity manifested? Is it more likely to appear in attitudes, behaviour, or both? Do women also play a role in maintaining rigid ideas about what they expect from men's behaviour? Are

the expectations women have of men in terms of behaviour and attitudes the same as the ones men have of themselves? Does homosexuality in men actually help to reinforce gender role rigidity, or is it a manifestation of it? In order to explore these themes, the chosen research method was that of the interview.

THE INTERVIEW AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Face to face interviewing was chosen as the research method because it offers a wide range of question asking formats to the investigator. The interview enables the researcher to take advantage of the unexpected and is flexible enough to allow for probing of examples (unlike the questionnaire). Black and Champion (1976) state that there are two main reasons for employing the interview as a research tool: to describe and to explore. They state of the first:

Information obtained from interviews is particularly useful in providing insights into the discursive nature of social reality. With the possible exception of certain types of observation, perhaps no other type of research tool performs this function as well (Black and Champion, 1976:356-358).

In terms of elaboration, the interview according to Black and Champion (1976:359), "provides insights into unexplored dimensions of a topic". The interview also ends up raising more questions than it asks which provides some valuable hints for further study.

The interview in my study consisted of 44 questions (25 of which were open ended) designed to measure attitudes and behaviour concerning gender, homosexuality and lesbianism. Closed ended questions took the form of a series of statements

in which the respondents were asked simply to agree or disagree. These questions were posed at the end of the interview and were included primarily to check for consistency and to illicit more specific responses. In the open ended style questions, the respondents could qualify their answers as much as they liked whereas these highly structured statements forced the respondent to take a position (See Appendix A for interview guide).

The formulation of the interview guide took some time. Several pre-tests were conducted before the final draft. Because the questions were related to sensitive issues. I asked the pre-test volunteers to talk about how they perceived the questions, and whether they found any of them threatening or confusing. The interview guide went through several modifications before the actual sampling took place.

THE SAMPLE AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

Interviews were tape recorded and in general lasted between 35 to 60 minutes. The sample consisted of 15 male and 15 female undergraduate students recruited, for the most part, from the department of Sociology and Anthropology at Concordia University. A convenience sample, rather than a random sample, was conducted because my main objective was to compare males and females and not to generalize to the larger population. The sample was taken from within the department primarily due to the lack of financial resources. Interviews were conducted in an office which was graciously provided by the department; thus eliminating transportation and rental costs.

One important characteristic of my particular sample

is its high level of education compared to the general population. Statistics from 1986 show that only 19% of the Canadian population had earned a university degree (Canadian World Almanac, 1991:340). Studies like the opinion survey conducted by Sherrill in 1977 found that the higher the level of education, the more willing respondents were to support gay and lesbian rights. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt that homosexuality was "never wrong", "sometimes wrong", or "always wrong". Sherrill reported that:

Over 42% of those with graduate education see little wrong with homosexuality...only when respondents had less than a high-school education were disproportionate numbers thinking homosexuality always or almost always wrong and therefore opposing gay rights. Indeed, 46.3% of those with less than high school opposed all gay rights, and these people account for 58.4% of the people in the study who oppose gay rights (Sherrill, 1977:37).

Thus, the Concordia sample provides a stringent test of these attitudes and behaviours related to sexuality and gender. One would expect intolerance and conservatism, including gender stereotypes and homophobia, to be at its lowest within this highly educated group.

Another aspect which makes my sample a stringent test of the hypothesis is the high concentration of social science students. There is an assumption that students in the social sciences are more tolerant given that the discipline questions underlying motives and/or goals of fostering certain attitudes such as racism or sexism in society. Social scientists generally study social phenomena and attempt to explain it. Students of any society or culture automatically assume to some degree that human behaviour is a product of the structure in

which it is confined.

The respondents in my sample were recruited in one of two ways: they were asked to participate by way of announcement in their individual classes by professors of the department, or signed up for interviews in the Sociology and Anthropology reading room where notices were posted. Although I had previous contact with some of the respondents in the study, none of them were close personal friends. Of the sample, 80% were part of the Sociology and Anthropology program, 20% were from other disciplines such as History, Journalism and English but were enrolled in either a Sociology or Anthropology course. 50% of the sample described themselves as either 3rd or 4th year students, 23% were second year students and 27% were first year. The approximate breakdown with regard to gender and year of study was not considered to affect the results. In fact, 30% of males were in their 3rd or 4th year as compared to only 20% of female respondents indicating that males in the sample were more likely to have completed at least two years of university as compared to females who were more likely to be in their first or second year of study. Age varied between 18 and 28 with the mean age being 21 years.

This sample was extremely homogeneous in terms of ethnicity and religiosity. The respondents were white, middle class and Judeo-Christian. The extreme socio-cultural homogeneity of this sample was not a result of a conscious decision to control for these factors. However, there was an awareness on my part that these variables could possibly create differences in terms of the findings. If this sample had turned out to be more heterogeneous, these factors would have been

accounted for in the final analysis.

This sample was also 99% heterosexual. Only 1 respondent identified as "other than" heterosexual. Since I was interested in how homophobia, and in particular homosexism, acts to socially control masculinity, there was initially the concern about the need to control for sexual orientation. There was an assumption on my part, that by virtue of their sexual orientations, gays and lesbians would not be homophobic or homosexist. Although this assumption can not be supported based on only 1 individual in this particular sample, there is little evidence to suggest that gay men or lesbians would be more or less concerned than heterosexual men and women with gender proscriptions. Effeminacy in men, for example, is as stigmatized and despised in the Gay world as it is in mainstream society (Kleinberg in Kaufman, 1987:123-125).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDICATORS

With the help of three independent judges, indicators for each variable were developed using the actual responses gathered from the interview. These indicators were constructed by first listening to the interview tapes and recording the range of responses: the broadest kind of actual responses were considered at this stage. In other words, judges were instructed to record first, if the respondent was in agreement, disagreement, or positive or negative on the questions, where applicable. Secondly, it was necessary to record the main reasons given for the answer. Each respondent's elaboration on the questions was reserved for a deeper analysis. After the range of possible responses was recorded, they were collapsed

into similar types of rationalizations of answers.

We listened to the tapes again and independently placed respondents into one of the possible categories based on the indicators. Categories were given a numerical value in order to facilitate classification of the respondents in terms of a particular response. At this stage, the numbers in themselves were not meant to denote a higher degree of gender role rigidity, homosexuality, or conservatism, although responses were ordered in terms of the most positive answer to the most negative. For example, in response to one of the items used to measure gender role rigidity:

IN YOUR OPINION SHOULD MORE EFFORT BE PUT INTO HELPING WOMEN ACHIEVE EQUALITY WITH MEN IN SOCIETY? IF YES, WHAT KINDS OF THINGS SHOULD BE DONE? IF NO, WHY NOT?;

the responses ranged from:

(1) yes, more effort should be put on helping women achieve equality with men in society, and both the public and private sphere were discussed

(2) yes, there was agreement that more effort should be put on the part of society to help women achieve equality but only the public sphere was discussed

(3) yes, there should be more effort put on helping women achieve equality with men but only in terms of the private sphere

(4) no, women should do it themselves, there is no need for society to put more effort into helping women achieve equality

(5) no.

In this type of measurement construction, the existence of the category implies that at least one respondent provided this kind of response. To ensure that the indicators were flexible enough to allow the judges to decide easily where to place the respondent, the interview tapes were replayed and judges independently placed the respondent into the appropriate

category. Once satisfied that all judges were placing respondents into the same categories, the measure was deemed workable. If there was disagreement among the judges as to which category the responses belonged, the responses for that item were listened to again. Usually the second time, there was agreement. If agreement was still not obtained at this stage, simple majority ruled.

This method of variable construction accomplished two important tasks. First, it allowed for a way to manage a sizable amount of data by gaining a sense of the frequency of responses and where, if any, there were patterns to be explored. Secondly, because the possible responses were a result of what the respondents said, rather than created by what I thought I would find, the findings relating to the open ended questions are less biased.

Indicators of this type were constructed for all open ended questions (i.e., questions 1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 23, and 24). Other questions reflected a frequency count, as in, for example, the number of respondents who named "daycare worker" as a job which was "better suited" for females, or the adjectives used to describe gay males or lesbians (questions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 & 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, and 25). Totally closed ended questions which asked for a simple "agree" or "disagree" were simply counted in terms of percentages (Questions 26 to 44).

THE MEASUREMENT OF GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY

Gender role rigidity was measured along two dimensions. The two dimensions were designed to create a broad definition of the concept, which included attitudes as well as behaviour. These two dimensions were collapsed into one because attitudes are thought to give way to behaviour. The following represent the indicators which were constructed for gender role rigidity:

- (1) General attitudes concerning gender equality issues
- (2) Adherence or non adherence to gender rigid behaviour

The first dimension, general attitudes concerning gender equality issues, includes the following questions:

- (1) In your opinion, should more effort be put into helping women achieve equality with men in society?
- (28) In spite of all the talk of equality there is no denying the natural biological inequality between women and men.
- (30) Women should have the choice to keep their maiden name after marriage.
- (33) Women should be completely free to choose if they want an abortion or not.
- (41) Women should be given equal wages with men for work of equal value.

These particular questions were designed to measure very general attitudes towards equality issues. The responses judged as gender rigid were: nothing should be done to help women achieve equality, (or belief in equality was only related to one sphere), women were biologically unequal, should not have the choice to keep their name after marriage, should not have access to abortion, or equal wages with men.

The second dimension of gender-role rigidity, adherence or non adherence to gender rigid behaviour, includes questions:

(6) When you are out on a first date with someone, who generally pays?

(8) Do you currently live alone? Is there at least one female/male living with you?

(9) In regards to work you do in and around the house, which of the following tasks would you say you tend to do on a consistent basis? (see Appendix A for list of tasks).

(12) Would it be upsetting to you if you discovered that your sexual partner was more sexually experienced than you?

(32) Crying during the sad parts of movies is a completely natural thing for a man to do.

(34) Crying during the sad parts of movies is a completely natural thing for a woman to do.

(39) The higher participation rate of women in the labour force is responsible for the destruction of the nuclear family.

(40) It would be a good thing if women would become more like men in our society.

(43) I would find it hard to respect a man who stayed home and did housework while his wife followed her career.

(44) It would be a good thing if men would become more like women in our society.

This dimension was designed to measure gender rigid behaviour, as well as how important "traditional" gender role norms were to the respondent. Gender role rigid responses included feeling that males should always pay on a date, that a male partner should be more sexually experienced than the female, and that crying during a sad movie was "natural" for a woman, but not for a man. Agreement that women had brought about the deterioration of the nuclear family by working outside the home, and that women should become more like men in our society, but men should not become like women was coded gender rigid. Further, a response indicating a lack of respect for a man who stayed home and did housework was also labelled gender rigid.

In terms of household tasks, a list of tasks was prepared and each table was pre-coded as either traditionally

"female" or "male". This pre-coding was based on the findings from a study conducted by Hitchman (cited in Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978:55). Hitchman found that when husbands do "help" with housework, they tend to participate in the more creative and interesting tasks which are less boring, less monotonous, and require less time. These tasks are also usually done outside the house rather than inside. Based on this definition, the following represents how tasks were classified in terms of gender:

FEMALE

Dishes
Cleaning oven
Vacuuming/sweeping
Cleaning the toilet
Washing floors
Laundry
Picking up
Cooking
Dusting
Making Beds

MALE

Taking out garbage
Doing Repairs
Washing Car
Cleaning out garage
Mowing lawn
Washing windows

Respondents were questioned about their living arrangements: did they live alone and if not, who they lived with in terms of relationship and gender. They were then asked to say whether or not they did various tasks on a consistent basis. Tasks which did not apply to respondents, such as mowing the lawn if they lived in an apartment or washing the car if they did not own a car, were excluded from the final calculations. The individual living alone who did all tasks was not classified non gender rigid because he/she had no choice but to do these tasks. This question was evaluated in terms of the proportion of nontraditional tasks done. When it came to household tasks, since there was an uneven number of "male" and "female" defined

tasks, respondents must have indicated that they did at least 40% of non-traditional tasks. That is, females had to be found to do at least 2 non-traditional tasks out of 5, and males had to be found to do at least 4 non-traditional tasks out of 11. Variations in the number of non-traditional tasks and living arrangements were reserved for discussion purposes only.

UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY

The first step in a comparison between males and females in terms of gender role rigidity relied on a univariate analysis of the items (i.e., the frequency of responses). These items were then collapsed into "agree" and "disagree", or "positive" and "negative" categories where appropriate. Qualitative differences within these categories are reserved for a more in-depth analysis. Items which yielded less than a 30% variation in responses were discarded. The following table represents the results from the univariate analysis of the items under gender role rigidity:

	<u>GR.R.</u>	<u>RESPONSE RATE</u>
A	ITEM #1	57% PUBLIC ONLY
	ITEM #28	43% AGREE
	ITEM #30	90% AGREE
	ITEM #33	87% AGREE
	ITEM #41	100% AGREE
B	ITEM #6	73% GO DUTCH ON DATE
	ITEM #8 & 9	63% CROSS BOUNDARY
	ITEM #12	50% AGREE
	ITEM #32	87% AGREE
	ITEM #34	93% AGREE
	ITEM #39	40% AGREE
	ITEM #40	99% DISAGREE
	ITEM #43	93% DISAGREE
	ITEM #44	93% DISAGREE

Based on the above univariate analysis, the following items were retained due to the variation in responses: Items #1, and #28 under attitudes; and items #8 & 9, #12, and #39 in respect to behaviour. Inversely, items #30, #33, #41. #6, #32, #34, #40, #43, and #44 were discarded due to a variance of less than 30% in response rate.

INTER-ITEM VALIDITY OF GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY

A data file was created and each of the five remaining items were cross-tabulated using gamma in order to test inter-item validity. Gamma was used because it is appropriate for ordinal level data. Any item(s) which received a gamma of less than .20 were discarded. The following correlation matrix reports the results:

	I1	I9	I12	I28	I39
I1					
I9	-.09				
I12	-.90	-.27			
I28	.08	.029	.13		
I39	-.79	-.44	.27	-.33	

Questions #1 and #12 received a gamma of $-.90$. In other words, there is a strong negative association between how one feels about women needing help to achieve equality; and whether someone feels threatened or not by a more sexually experienced partner. Another strong negative association was found between questions #1 and #39 which received a gamma of $-.79$. Thus, the opinion one holds about women's role in the nuclear family is also associated with their belief about women's position in society in terms of equality. A significant negative relationship was found between questions #9 and #12 ($-.27$), whether one crosses the boundary in terms of housework, and whether they feel threatened by a more sexually experienced partner. How one feels about a more sexually experienced partner was also associated with ones opinion concerning the idea that women who work outside the home help to deteriorate the nuclear family (Q 12 & Q 39) with a gamma of $.27$.

All the items connected to gender role rigidity were found to be valid indicators. That is, all items were correlated to at least one other item with a gamma of $.20$ or more. Therefore, the following five items were used to develop the index for gender role rigidity:

(1) In your opinion, should more effort be put into helping women achieve equality with men in society?

(9) Which of the following household tasks would you say that you tend to do (or be willing to do) on a consistent basis?

(12) Would it be upsetting to you if you discovered that your sexual partner was more sexually experienced than you?

(28) In spite of all the talk of equality, there is no denying the natural biological inequality between women and men.

(39) The higher participation rate of women in the labour force is responsible for the deterioration of the nuclear family.

GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY INDEX

After determining which items should be included in the gender role rigidity index, each respondent was individually rated on each of the items selected. Respondents were given a (+) for a response indicating non gender rigidity, and a (-) for a response indicating gender rigidity. A respondent was judged gender rigid if 3-4 (60%) of his/her responses out of 5 were negative (-). If all 5 of his/her responses were negative, this was seen as extreme gender role rigidity. Inversely, if there were 2 or less negative responses, no gender role rigidity was present.

THE MEASUREMENT OF HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

It has already been stated that it is impossible for an individual to be homosexual without being homophobic. It is therefore important to include homophobia when seeking to understand homosexuality because homosexuality is in itself a component of it. As the anti-semitic is also a racist, the homosexual individual is also homophobic.

Two dimensions were also created to assess homosexuality and homophobia:

- (1) Attitudes towards homosexuality and lesbianism: need for social control
- (2) Degree of contact and/or willingness to establish contact with homosexuals and lesbians

The first dimension was designed to measure homophobia and thus does not target gays and lesbians separately. The second

dimension relates specifically to homosexuality and targets both gays and lesbians. The questions related to attitudes towards homosexuality were the following:

- (2) Would you support legislation which would give homosexual men and lesbians equal rights with heterosexuals in our society?
- (11) Do you believe that homosexuality and lesbianism constitute a threat to society?
- (29) Society was a better place when homosexual men and lesbians stayed in the closet.
- (36) Being propositioned by a gay man or lesbian would upset me a lot.

These questions were designed to examine beliefs surrounding the need to suppress gays and lesbians, as well as whether or not respondents would be disturbed by its visibility.

Responses were defined as homophobic if they supported restrictions on gay men and women in regards to occupational accessibility, adoption of children and so forth (Q2). Further if a response indicated a feeling of being threatened by homosexuality and lesbianism (Q11) and expressed the belief that it would be better if it was not openly displayed (Q29), these were seen as homophobic responses. Finally, if a response indicated that being sexually propositioned by a gay man or lesbian (Q36) would be upsetting, it was judged to be homophobic. Again, evaluation of homophobia/homosexism was based on how many of the significant responses labelled homophobic/ homosexualist were expressed.

The second dimension, designed to measure homosexuality, involved the use of several questions designed to determine how much contact respondents had had, or were willing to have with

"known" gay men and lesbians. They included:

- (16) Do you have any male friends who are homosexual?
(if no) Do you think you would feel comfortable
having a homosexual friend? (why or why not?)
- (17) Do you have any female friends who are lesbian?
(if no) Do you think you would feel comfortable
having a homosexual friend? (why or why not?)
- (19) Have you ever gone to a bar that caters
specifically to homosexual men?
- (20) Have you ever gone to a bar that caters
specifically to lesbians?

An unwillingness to interact with gays if male, or lesbians if female, was interpreted to be a sign of homosexuality. If respondents did not have homosexual/lesbian friends or had never gone to a gay or lesbian bar, they were asked about their willingness to do so if the opportunity arose. Thus, homosexuality was based on a conscious unwillingness to interact with gay or lesbian individuals.

UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

As with gender role rigidity, a univariate analysis was done with the items related to homophobia/homosexism. Items were collapsed into "agree" and "disagree" or "positive" and "negative" where appropriate. Those items with a variance of less than 30% were rejected. The following represents the univariate distribution of the responses:

<u>HOMOPHOBIA</u>	<u>RESPONSE RATE</u>	
ITEM #2	53%	AGREE
ITEM #11	53%	AGREE
ITEM #29	67%	AGREE
ITEM #36	75%	DISAGREE

HOMOSEXISMRESPONSE RATE

ITEM #16	47%	CONTACT
ITEM #17	47%	CONTACT
ITEM #19	27%	YES
ITEM #20	34%	YES

Based on the 30% criteria, items #2, #11, and #29 were retained under homophobia; and items #16, #17, #19, and #20 under homosexuality. Item #36 was discarded.

INTER-ITEM VALIDITY OF HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

The next step was to create a data file with these items. Using gamma, items were cross tabulated to determine inter-item validity. Homophobia and homosexuality was collapsed into one variable. Any item which did not obtain a gamma of .20 was not considered significant. The following correlation matrix illustrates the relationship between these 7 items:

	I2	I11	I29	I16	I17	I19	I20
I2							
I11	-.72						
I29	-.80	.45					
I16	.59	.88	.29				
I17	.53	.88	.16	.69			
I19	-.02	.50	.12	.56	.61		
I20	.98	.60	.12	.70	.70		

Item #2 and item #11 received a gamma of $-.72$ indicating a strong negative association between ideas concerning the support of gay rights, and the threat of homosexuality/lesbianism to society. Items #2 and #16 received a $.59$, indicating a moderate association between gay rights and willingness to have gay male friends. There was also a strong positive association between item #2 and #20 ($.98$), gay rights support, and willingness to attend a lesbian bar. Item #2 was also strongly associated negatively with item #29 ($-.80$), the opinion concerning homosexuals and lesbians staying in the closet. Item #11 (feelings about the threat of homosexuality) was positively associated with #16 (willingness to have gay friends), with a gamma of $.88$. The willingness to attend a lesbian bar (#20) was also associated to opinions concerning the "threat" of homosexuality with a gamma of $.60$. The willingness to attend a gay bar (#19) also showed a correlation with whether one saw homosexuality as a threat or not with a gamma of $.50$. This idea of threat or non-threat was further correlated with the attitude concerning society being better if homosexuality stayed in the closet (#29), the gamma being $.45$. Finally, the willingness to have a lesbian friend is associated with lesbian bar attendance (#17 and #20) with a gamma of $.70$. A somewhat weaker relationship ($.56$) also appeared between a willingness to have a gay male friend (#16), and gay bar attendance (#19).

All items demonstrated some correlation to all other items with a gamma of $.20$ or more. Therefore, all items were

retained. Five items comprised the index for homophobia/homosexism, and are as follows:

- (2) Would you support legislation which would give homosexual men and lesbians equal rights with heterosexuals in our society? (coded as "yes" or "no")
- (11) Do you believe that homosexuality and lesbianism constitute a threat to society? (coded as "yes" or "no")
- (16 & 17) Do you have any friends (or would you being willing to have friends) who are homosexual/lesbian? (coded as "yes" or "no")
- (19 & 20) Have you ever gone (or would you be willing to go) to a bar which caters specifically to homosexual men/lesbians? (coded as "yes" or "no")
- (29) Society was a much better place when homosexual men and lesbians staying in the closet? (coded "agree" or "disagree")

HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM INDEX

The same rating system was applied to the homophobia/homosexism index as was to the index for gender role rigidity. The respondent was given a (-) for a response judged homophobic/homosexist, and a (+) for a response which was not homophobic/homosexist. For a respondent to be judged homophobic/homosexist, at least 60% of his/her responses had to be evaluated as such. However, there are two exceptions to the index for homophobia/homosexism. Because the measurement of homosexuality applies to only same sex homosexuals, questions specific to opposite sexed homosexuals were redundant. Therefore, items 2, 11, and 29, which measures homophobia appear in both indexes for males and females. However, only items 16 and 19 appear in the index for male respondents, and

only items 17 and 20 appear in the index for female respondents when it comes to homosexuality.

A CONSIDERATION OF RELATED VARIABLES

Four other variables were introduced in this study. The first two, perceptions of gender role suitability and ideal gender type construction, were thought to be related to gender role rigidity. The first was measured by the following questions:

- (4) Occupational Suitability by gender.
- (15) Do you believe that a man is/should be "king of the castle?"
- (42) Because of their aggressive natures, men make much better leaders overall.

The correlation of this variable to gender role rigidity was thought to take the form of the expression of traditional views. For example, responses seen as traditional were females and males as being better suited for different jobs, and men being better leaders in the public and private sphere.

The second, that of ideal gender type construction, was measured using the following questions:

- (14) Who is the person or the fictional character that you least admire?
- (21) Who is the person or the fictional character that you admire the least?
- (22) The traits you admire most in a man are?
- (25) The traits you admire most in a woman are?

Responses which indicated an admiration of women were seen as less traditional than those which indicated an admiration of men. Further, those responses which indicated an admiration of "non-traditional" men and "non-traditional" women were also

seen as less traditional. Finally, traits admired and not admired in males and females were listed by gender as either "passive" or "active" (Broverman et al., 1972). These traits were not broken down by respondent but rather designed to give an overall comparison by gender of traits thought to be appropriate to males or females.

The last two variables, sexual fixedness and the attribution of cross sexed traits and mannerisms, were thought to be connected to homophobia and homosexuality. Sexual fixedness, was measured by the following questions:

- (13) Do you believe it is possible for a heterosexual male to become sexually involved with a homosexual male?
- (18) Do you think it is possible for a heterosexual woman to become sexually involved with a lesbian?
- (23) Why do you think some men are homosexual?
- (24) Why do you think some women are lesbians?
- (26) Sex between two men is as natural as between a woman and a man.
- (31) Sex between two women is as natural as between a man and a woman.
- (37) A gay man could easily be seduced by the right woman.
- (27) A lesbian can be easily seduced by the right man.

Those responses which indicated that sexual involvement with a gay man or lesbian by a heterosexual individual was not possible, or only possible under specific circumstances were coded as "sexually fixed". Further, responses which indicated that homosexuality and lesbianism was biological, and would not think it possible for a homosexual/lesbian individuals to engage in heterosexual sex also were coded "sexually fixed".

The attribution of cross-sexed mannerisms and traits was measured by the following questions:

- (3) If you were at a party where one of the male guests was homosexual, do you think you would be able to identify that man as a homosexual without it being told to you?
- (5) If you were at a party where one of the female guests was a lesbian, do you think you would be able to identify that woman as a lesbian without it being told to you?
- (7) Occupational preference for gay men.
- (10) Occupational preference for lesbian women.
- (35) Most male homosexual have some identifiable feminine characteristic.
- (38) Most lesbians have some identifiable masculine characteristic.

Those responses indicating that they could pick the gay or lesbian individual out of a crowd and that these gay men were "feminine" and lesbians were "masculine", were coded as "stereotyping". Further, "stereotyping" was thought to exist when a response indicated that gay and lesbian individuals would identify with gender preferences and traits in terms of occupations of the opposite gender.

The next two chapters will present the findings regarding gender role rigidity, homophobia/homosexism, and the four other related variables. The overall analysis of these findings will include actual verbatim taken from the interviews.

CHAPTER THREE: MAKING CONNECTIONS GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY, HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM, AND GENDER

In this chapter, the data from those items found to be significant to the relationship between gender and gender role rigidity, as well as gender and homophobia/homosexism will be looked at.

Because this is a case study which involved only university students and was of a small size ($n=30$), these findings cannot be generalized to the larger population. However, the results can be useful in regards to suggesting direction for further research in the area.

GENDER AND GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY

The relationship of gender and gender role rigidity will be examined on two levels: the extent and nature of gender role rigidity in relation to each individual item; and overall gender role rigidity in regards to the index. We will begin by examining the responses to each item.

In view of the first item related to the gender rigidity index, males in general were less likely than females to consider the private sphere as one of inequality for women (see table 1). Although males felt that more should be done to help women achieve equality at work, the home was a different matter. Females were divided between their concern with the public and private sphere, or with the public alone. Males emphasized only the public sphere in terms of equality for women. In general, respondents were more concerned with the public sphere. The findings here fit the trend that women are crossing the gender boundary, that is, gaining ground in the

labour force and being reinforced for it, but that little has changed when it comes to how their traditional role in the home is seen.

Females in general felt that men should do their share in the private sphere. As housework and childcare have been defined as female tasks in our society, males do not consider that they should take an equal share in them. Taking an equal share in female defined tasks implies crossing the gender boundary and running the risk of appearing "feminine".

This denial of women's inequality at home likely relates to the fact that males more than females do not cross the boundary in terms of household tasks (see table 2a & 2b). This pattern suggests that males believe that women should cross the boundary in regards to being equal to men outside the home, but that men do not have to cross the boundary in terms of the private sphere. In other words, housework is still considered to be women's work. More than that, the fact that housework is thought to be the responsibility of women, was not seen as contributing to inequality for women.

The mean number of "traditional female" tasks males do by living arrangement are presented in table 2a. Table 2b shows the mean number of "traditional male" tasks females do by living arrangement. We can see that the amount of "female" tasks males do appears to be directly affected by their living arrangement. The males who did the lowest mean number of tasks like dishes, sweeping, picking up, cooking etc. were those who lived at home with their parents or parent (in all cases, a mother was present). Although 5 male respondents described themselves as living at home with their mothers, the mean

number of tasks done was 1 out of a possible 11. Those with either roommate or wife/cohabitant present did between 6 tasks for a female roommate, to 2.7 tasks for a wife or cohabitant. Those males who lived alone did the highest number of "female type" tasks simply because they had no choice.

Although female respondents did all 5 of the "male type" tasks when they lived alone because they had to, the relationship between the mean number of tasks and living arrangement was not the same. Females did the least "male type" tasks when living with both a male and female roommate (2), at home (2.1), or when living with another female only (1.3). When living with a husband/cohabitant, females were inclined to do slightly more "male type" tasks than when at home, or with only a female roommate. With females, the greatest difference in terms of the mean tasks done is in the extreme categories, when females live alone, like males, they do all "nontraditional" tasks, and it is when they are at home with their parents that they do the least number of "nontraditional" tasks. Further, females do more "nontraditional" tasks at home than do males who live at home.

The data suggest that males are less likely than females to participate in "non-traditional" tasks. Females cross the gender boundary and do male defined tasks when other males are present. Males cross the boundary to do female defined tasks, only when they are alone. The results of this question suggest that males are not comfortable in involving themselves with the private sphere in terms of housework

TABLE 1
ATTITUDE ON PROMOTION OF EQUALITY FOR WOMEN BY GENDER

	FEMALES(N=15)	MALES(N=15)
YES (BOTH SPHERES)	47%(7)	7%(1)
PUBLIC ONLY	40%(6)	73%(11)
PRIVATE ONLY	0%(0)	0%(0)
UP TO WOMEN	14%(2)	20%(3)

TABLE 2a
"FEMALE" TYPE TASKS DONE BY LIVING ARRANGEMENT

	MALES(N=15)	
LIVING ARRANGEMENT	NO. OF RES.	MEAN TASKS DONE
LIVE ALONE	2	11
ROOMMATE (FEMALE)	1	6
ROOMMATE (FEM/MALE)	4	5.5
WIFE/COHABITANT	3	2.7
LIVE AT HOME/FEMALE PRESENT	5	1
*HIGHEST NUMBER OF TASKS=11		

TABLE 2b
MALE "TYPE" TASKS DONE BY LIVING ARRANGEMENT

	FEMALES(N=15)	
LIVING ARRANGEMENT	NUMBER OF RES.	MEAN TASKS DONE
LIVE ALONE	1	5
ROOMMATE (FEMALE)	3	1.3
ROOMMATE (FEM/MALE)	3	2
HUSBAND/COHABITANT	1	3
LIVE AT HOME/FEMALE PRESENT	7	2.1
*HIGHEST NUMBER OF TASKS=5		

because the private sphere is still defined as a "female" one. To participate to any great extent in this "female" domain is threatening to masculinity.

Further, 7 males and 5 females tended to adopt the attitude that women who worked outside the home were responsible for the deterioration of the nuclear family (see table 3). Clearly there is a contradiction when it comes to the males in my sample. On one hand, males feel that women should be given more equality in the workforce, but that this equality should not be given at the expense of the family. This response may reflect that there is an interest in the preservation of the family, and that the traditional relationship of the father who goes out to work, and the mother who stays at home is still the "ideal" one to some respondents in my sample.

There was little significant difference between males and females when it came to how they felt about women being biologically unequal to men (see table 4). The thought that women were biologically unequal was agreed to by 6 females and 7 males.

Males in my sample were more likely than females to be concerned with the amount of sexual experience their sexual partners had (See table 5). For example, when asked if they would be upset finding out that their sexual partners were more sexually experienced than they were, 10 males in the sample, as compared with only 5 of the females said "yes". Further, of the 6 males who said they would feel threatened due to OTHER reasons, 2 of them stated that they would "question the character" of a woman who was more sexually experienced than

they were, and 1 male stated that he would feel intimidated by her. This respondent was concerned that she would "compare" him to all her other lovers. For example, he stated:

Well I don't know, I'd feel funny if she slept with lots of men. I'd feel like I was being compared (M6).

Another male said:

I'd have nothing to teach her...I don't know, I suppose I shouldn't feel this way but ya, it would bug me a little (M4).

Half the male respondents (3) who said they would feel threatened for OTHER reasons indicated that "being a man" somehow entitled them to be more sexually experienced than women. There was also a concern with "performance" on the part of 6 of the males. These males worried about measuring up with a female sex partner who had had other lovers with which she could make a comparison.

It is useful here to place those male respondents who would be concerned with the morality of a more sexually experienced woman together with those who said they would be intimidated by her, and those who felt that men should be more sexually experienced than women by virtue of "maleness". Thus we can say that 6 males would prefer to be more sexually experienced than females, where only 1 female respondent preferred the male to be more experienced. The majority of females (9) responded that "it would be fun" if he were more sexually experienced but more importantly, that they did not "expect" him to be. Fewer males (5) in comparison stated that a more sexually experienced woman would not bother them. One female preferred that he "not have too many lovers before me" because I would feel that I "was being compared" or would feel

TABLE 3
AGREE THAT WORKING WOMEN DETERIORATED NUCLEAR FAMILY/BY GENDER

	FEMALES (N=15)	MALES (N=15)
WOMEN DETER OF FAMILY	33% (5)	47% (7)

TABLE 4
BIOLOGICAL INEQUALITY/BY GENDER

	AGREE	
	FEMALE (N=15)	MALE (N=14)
WOMEN BIOLOGICALLY UNEQUAL	40% (6)	50% (7)

TABLE 5
SEXUAL EXPERIENCE THREAT BY GENDER

	FEMALES (N=14)	MALES (N=15)
NOT AT ALL	64% (9)	34% (5)
YES/DISEASE	29% (4)	27% (4)
YES/OTHER	7% (1)	41% (6)

somewhat "jealous". Overall, sexual experience is still an area where the males in my sample felt they should dominate. Even the males who reported being indifferent or thought that it would be an advantage if their partner had more sexual experience expressed some concern about the "number of lovers" their sexual partners would have. For example, 5 of them asked something along the line of "how much sexual experience are you talking about?" or "I wouldn't be concerned as long as it wasn't 700 lovers or something like that". This suggests that men feel insecure when they have less sexual experience than their partners.

THE GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY INDEX

In terms of simple percentages, there were some significant differences which demonstrated that males were more gender rigid than females in this sample. More importantly, males were shown to be more gender rigid according to the index. Index scores demonstrated that only 1 female responded to more than 2 items in a way which was seen as gender rigid, compared to 7 of the males (see table 6).

Items which proved to be significant in the gender rigid index are related to the family, and "traditional" gender roles. Equality for women is limited when it comes to the family. It appears that the family is still a male preserve, and women are expected to give their priority to it. All should appear equal in public, but in the private, women should do the housework, not let their jobs interfere with the family, and not be "too sexually experienced".

TABLE 6
GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY AND GENDER

GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY	GENDER	
	FEMALE	MALE
EQUALITY FOR WOMEN ONLY IN ONE SPHERE	40%(N=15)	73%(N=15)
DO NOT CROSS BOUNDARY IN HOUSEHOLD TASKS	21%(N=14)*	61%(N=13)*
WORKING WOMEN DETERIORATE NUCLEAR FAMILY	33%(N=15)	47%(N=15)
WOMEN BIOLOGICALLY UNEQUAL TO MEN	40%(N=15)	50%(N=14)**
SEXUALLY THREATENED BY MORE EXPERIENCED SEX PARTNER	36%(N=14)***	67%(N=15)
NUMBER OF GENDER RIGID ON 3-5 ITEMS	1	7

* THESE FIGURES EXCLUDE THOSE WHO LIVE ALONE

** ONE MALE RESPONDENT DID NOT ANSWER

*** ONE FEMALE RESPONDENT DID NOT ANSWER

GENDER AND HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

In order to gain insight into gender and homophobia/homosexism, it is important to first look at each of the items individually before presenting the index. The first item revealed that 6 females and 8 males were opposed to extending equal rights to homosexuals and lesbians in our society (see table 7). Refusal to award homosexuals and lesbians equal rights with heterosexuals is likely related to the next item where 6 of the males and 2 of the females responded that they felt homosexuality was a threat to society (see table 7). Those who were concerned with the "threat" of homosexuality stated that the threat would be possible if "there were more homosexuals than heterosexuals and it affected reproduction" or "they try to impose their sexual orientations on us".

The "threat" of homosexuality may also be related to the third item in the index which explored the idea that homosexuals and lesbians should stay in the closet (see table 7). There was a significant difference between how males and females felt about homosexuality and lesbianism staying in the closet. None of the females but 10 of the males agreed that society was better when gays and lesbians stayed in the closet.

Thus, males are more likely than females to view homosexuality and lesbianism as a threat, and to wish it would remain hidden.

TABLE 7
EQUAL RIGHTS FOR HOMOSEXUALS, HOMOSEXUALITY A THREAT,
HOMOSEXUALITY SHOULD STAY IN CLOSET/BY GENDER

	FEMALE (N=15)	MALE (N=15)
OPPOSED TO EQ. RIGHTS	40% (6)	53% (8)
HOMOSEXUALITY A THREAT	13% (2)	40% (6)
HOMOSEXUALS SHOULD STAY IN CLOSET	0% (0)	67% (10)

About half the respondents in my sample (7 males and 7 females) were willing to have a friendship with homosexuals of the same sex (see table 8). Although there is no difference in the number of respondents who were willing to have a same-sex homosexual friend, 8 males felt it necessary to distinguish between "friend" and "acquaintance" in regard to gay males. For example, 4 of these males, when asked, "DO YOU HAVE ANY MALE FRIENDS WHO ARE HOMOSEXUAL?" replied yes, but they were not friends but acquaintances. This was not the case with those males who claimed to have lesbian friends. This may imply that males are more homophobic in their uneasiness in accepting a male homosexual as a "friend" than are women who accept lesbians as "friends". Perhaps the word is threatening in the sense that the label of "friend" could be interpreted as a euphemism for an individual's gay lover. Male respondents felt compelled to clarify the nature of their relationship with the

gay male: "he's someone I work with" or, "he's not a friend really...in the real sense".

The willingness to go to a gay or lesbian bar, and how respondents feel about it, is represented in Tables 9 and 10. The findings reveal that 7 females would feel extremely uncomfortable in a lesbian bar, but only 1 female said she would feel extremely uncomfortable in a gay bar. Males were as likely to feel extremely uncomfortable in a gay bar as they were in a lesbian bar. For example, 6 males said they would be extremely uncomfortable in a gay bar, and 5 of them would feel extremely uncomfortable in a lesbian bar.

Female and male subjects offered different reasons for their attitudes depending on whether the bar catered to gay men or to lesbians. Males said that being uncomfortable in a gay bar was related to one of two things: fear of being labelled "gay", or fear of being approached and sexually propositioned and cornered in some way. The uneasiness they would feel in a lesbian bar was mostly related to their own behaviour and how lesbian women would interpret it. Males stated that being in a lesbian bar would make them feel "sexually frustrated" and that they would have to be careful that they were not seen as "cruising anyone". Males also stated that "I would feel like the enemy" or "they would probably throw me out" and "I'd have no reason to go there".

A Lesbian bar also elicited some different responses from females. Those females who would be, or had been, uncomfortable in a lesbian bar said the same things that males did about gay bars, "people would think I was a lesbian" or "I wouldn't know what to do if someone approached me and tried to

TABLE 8
CONTACT OR WILLINGNESS FOR CONTACT WITH GAY MALES/
LESBIANS BY GENDER

	FEMALE (N=15)	MALE (N=15)
GAY MALES	53% (8)	47% (7)
LESBIANS	47% (7)	53% (8)

TABLE 9
GAY BAR ATTENDANCE BY GENDER

	FEMALE (N=15)	MALE (N=15)
HAVE GONE/COMFORT	34% (5)	27% (4)
WOULD NOT GO/HAVE GONE/DISCOMFORT	60% (9)	33% (5)
WOULD NOT GO/ EXTREMELY DISCOMFORT	6% (1)	40% (6)

TABLE 10
LESBIAN BAR ATTENDANCE BY GENDER

	FEMALE (N=15)	MALE (N=15)
HAVE GONE/COMFORT	34% (5)	27% (4)
WOULD NOT GO/HAVE GONE/UNCOMFORT	20% (3)	40% (6)
WOULD NOT GO/ EXTREMELY DISCOMFORT	47% (7)	34% (5)

pick me up". Most females in this category said they had nothing in common with lesbians and they would not know how to act with them. Further, these females felt there was no reason to go there unless you were a lesbian yourself.

THE HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM INDEX

The index for homophobia/homosexism supports the hypothesis that males are more homophobic and sexist than females. On the 5 item index of homophobia/homosexism, 7 males as compared to only 3 females responded to 3 or more of the items in a way which indicated homophobia/homosexism (see table 11).

TABLE 11
HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM AND GENDER

HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM	GENDER	
	FEMALES	MALES
DO NOT SUPPORT EQUAL RIGHTS FOR HOMOSEXUALS/LESBIANS	40%(N=15)	53%(N=15)
HOMOSEXUALITY/LESBIANS ARE A THREAT TO SOCIETY	13%(N=15)	40%(N=15)
SOCIETY WAS A BETTER PLACE WHEN HOMOSEXUALS/ LESBIANS STAYED IN CLOSET	0%(N=15)	67%(N=15)
NOT WILLING TO ESTABLISH CONTACT WITH SAME-SEXED HOMOSEXUALS	53%(N=15)	53%(N=15)
NOT WILLING TO GO TO SAME- SEXED BAR	67%(N=15)	73%(N=15)
NUMBER OF HOMOPHOBIC/ HOMOSEXIST ON 3-5 ITEMS	3	7

The dominate themes which appear in the homophobia/homosexism scale are related to an interest in the preservation of the traditional aspects of gender and sexuality. By remaining invisible, homosexuality present little challenge to traditional gender roles. Not wanting to establish contact is likely to be related to the rationale that if homosexuality is not seen, it does not present any threat.

There was a qualitative difference in the way homophobic/homosexist males described going to a gay bar, as opposed to non homophobic/homosexist males in my sample. If they had been to a gay bar, the homophobic/homosexist males tended to report a more negative experience or state that they went there "by accident and would not go back". One of these males stated:

Why would I go there? I have no reason to...people would think I was gay if I went there (M3).

Another felt that:

What would I do if someone came on at me...they would all be looking at me...staring. I'd feel very uneasy (M6).

One male who went to a gay bar by accident stated:

We knew it was a gay bar when we saw these two guys ...well kissing, and we got to hell out of there (M5).

Those males who were not homophobic/homosexist expressed some degree of curiosity and attraction to gay sexuality. One of these males stated that he felt "comfortable in a gay bar dancing with friends" (M2). He further stated:

I went dancing in a gay bar with some friends, I had a really good time. I was up dancing on the floor, I wasn't grossed out or anything...no one bothered me. I went back a few times...the music was great (M2).

The idea that some non homophobic/homosexist males regarded sexuality as simply "sexuality" rather than "homosexuality" or "heterosexuality", and did not connect either category with "masculinity", could very well be one of the most crucial factors in the link between gender role rigidity and homosexuality. As Herek (cited in Kimmel, 1987:72) argued, heterosexuality is thought to be the central core of masculinity, one cannot be both a "man" and a gay man. Those who do not consider heterosexuality as the "core" of masculine identity may well be the individuals who are less concerned with "appearing" gay, and, therefore, are less homophobic/homosexist and less gender rigid.

It has been hypothesized that contact with gay men decreases homophobia. For example, Morin and Garfinkle in 1978 stated that:

Interaction with gay men of similar social status appears to be a crucial experience in altering homophobic attitudes and behaviour (p.43).

My data does not appear to support their conclusion, especially in regards to males. Males in my sample were more homophobic/homosexist than females according to the index (7 as compared to 3), yet they were as likely to have contact with gay men as females were (7 males as compared to 8 females). Thus, Morin and Garfinkle's conclusions only held true for the females in

my sample, but appeared to have little impact on the males. What may be problematic is that even if individuals say they are willing to have a gay or lesbian friend, or do have a friend who is gay or lesbian, it is not known how these friendships or "hypothetical" friendships are defined. One interesting question for further research would be to conduct a study of individuals who have both homosexual and heterosexual friends and compare those friendships.

Another issue which would be worth investigating involves the question of whether contact with homosexuals actually decreases homophobia, or whether these individuals are non homophobic in the first place.

The present study found that the seven males who were gender rigid were the same ones who were homophobic/homosexist. Thus, among males in my sample, there is a perfect correlation between gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism. This was not found to be the case for the females, however.

It can be concluded from these findings that: (1) females in this study were not as gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist as males and, (2) gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism is not as highly related in females as it is in males. Females can be homophobic/homosexist without being gender rigid. However, we must keep in mind that a sample of 30 makes these kinds of conclusions merely suggestive.

The following chapter will focus on the four other variables hypothesized to be associated with gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER VARIABLES

GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY AND GENDER SUITABILITY

The idea that one gender is more suitable than the other for certain responsibilities and/or tasks may act as an efficient rationalization for gender role rigid individuals. If it can be claimed that certain characteristics are indeed more developed in one gender or the other, then gender role individuals can point to this as justification for gender exclusion. The exclusion of females from certain areas deemed "male" is usually related to power. For example, the first question respondents were asked was if they thought that a man should be king of the castle and why? The majority of females and males replied "no". However, 4 gender rigid males connected power in the home clearly with money arguing that the one who made the most money should be "king". Since women make on average only 64 cents for every \$1.00 a man makes (Stats Canada: 1982), this rationale is an extremely effective one for claiming dominance. Gender rigid individuals reserve the private sphere as one where men should dominate. The fact that power is equated with money under capitalism ensures that men will be the "boss" at home because they bring in more income.

With the exception of 5 gender rigid males, the idea that men make better leaders due to "their aggressive natures", was rejected by all respondents in the sample. Thus gender rigid males are more conservative when it comes to choosing a woman as leader. As leadership implies "activity", the definition of male as "active" apparently qualifies him to be a better candidate for leadership in the eyes of some males in my

sample. The fact that gender rigid men tend to see women as biologically unequal links with the idea that it is not in their "nature" to be aggressive. Here gender role rigidity is related to the public domain. What is interesting is that gender role rigidity arises in the public sphere only with the issue of women leading men politically. Gender rigid individuals appear to want equality for women at work, but equality does not mean superiority, or leadership.

The idea that women and men are better suited for some things than for others was tested in relation to occupations. Various occupations were written on cue cards and respondents were provided with three main headings, MALE, FEMALE, and BOTH. They were asked to place the occupational card under the heading which they felt would be "better suited" for that particular gender. It was explained to the respondents that "better suited" was not the same as "better qualified". In other words, respondents were asked "given the same skills and training, who would be better suited for that particular occupation".

The first reaction for at least 50% of all respondents was to say that there was little point going through the cards because they did not intend to stereotype and would end up placing all the cards under the "both" heading. However, in spite of this, these respondents did go on to type males and females in terms of occupational suitability. Table 12 represents the occupations which were designated as better suited for MALES by gender and gender role rigidity, and Table 13 represents the occupations which were designated as better

TABLE 12
OCCUPATIONS TYPED AS "MALE BETTER SUITED" BY GENDER AND GENDER
ROLE RIGIDITY

	FEMALES(N=15)			MALES(N=15)		
	* GENRIG.	N.GENRIG.	T.	GENRIG.	N.GENRIG.	T.
BOUNCER	1	9	10	7	2	9
SOLDIER	1	6	7	6	0	6
WELDER	1	3	4	7	0	7
PLUMBER	1	3	4	6	0	6
TRUCKER	1	1	2	7	0	7
PILOT	1	0	1	2	2	4
LAWYER	0	0	0	2	0	2
POLICE	0	0	0	2	0	2
DOCTOR	0	0	0	2	0	2

* GENRIG = GENDER ROLE RIGID RESPONDENTS
 N.GENRIG = NON GENDER RIGID RESPONDENTS
 T. = TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

TABLE 13
OCCUPATIONS TYPED AS "FEMALE BETTER SUITED" BY GENDER AND
GENDER ROLE RIGIDITY

	FEMALES (N=15)			MALES (N=15)		
	*GENRIG.	N.GENRIG.	T.	GENRIG.	N.GENRIG.	T.
DAYCARE WORK	1	1	2	6	2	8
MAID	1	3	4	4	0	4
NURSE	1	3	4	3	0	3
SECRETARY	1	1	2	5	0	5
SOCIAL WORK	1	1	2	4	0	4
BANK TELLER	1	0	1	4	0	4
HAIRDRESSER	1	0	1	3	0	3
FLORIST	1	1	2	1	0	1
BALLET DANCER	0	0	0	3	0	3
POLITICIAN	0	2	2	1	0	1
LAWYER	0	2	2	0	0	0

* GENRIG = GENDER ROLE RIGID RESPONDENTS
N.GENRIG = NON GENDER ROLE RIGID RESPONDENTS
T. = TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

suited for FEMALES by gender and gender role rigidity. Occupations which were thought to be suited to "both" were not included because they proved to be irrelevant to the present analysis.

If we look at Table 12 we see that the majority of males (10) and females (9) designated "bouncer" as the leading male occupation in terms of "suitability". The role of soldier was also seen as being better suited for males by almost half of the respondents (13). Gender rigid males were more likely than non gender rigid males to type these two occupations as "male", the reverse was true for females. Gender rigid females were less likely to type these occupations as male occupations. Gender rigid males also typed the occupations of welder (7), plumber (6), and trucker as "male" (7). Females, gender rigid or not, typed welder and plumber as male occupations (one gender rigid, 3 non gender rigid on each item), although not to the same extent as males. Females also did not type trucker as a male occupation to the same extent as males did (only 2 females, one gender rigid, one not gender rigid).

Some males also had difficulty with the idea of women pilots (2 gender rigid, 2 non gender rigid), whereas female respondents had less trouble seeing women as suitable in that occupation. Females, unlike males, did not type lawyer, police officer, or doctor. Gender rigid males, were more likely than non gender rigid males to type lawyer, police, and doctor as male occupations.

In Table 13 "Female" typed occupations are presented.

The top profession for females was that of daycare worker (6 gender rigid males, and 2 non gender rigid, as compared to only 2 females, one of which was gender rigid). Female respondents overall are less likely than males to type occupations as suited for females. Further, males who are gender rigid are most likely of the four groups to do the "typing".

These two data sets reveal some interesting things about the connection between gender role rigidity and the social construction of masculinity and femininity. The first observation we can make is that gender rigid individuals, (especially males since there are 7 of them) type some occupations as being better suited for different genders. For example, the top "female" occupation is daycare worker for male respondents, the top "male" occupation for both male and female respondents is "bouncer". Further, this typing is likely to be directly connected to stereotyped views of gender. For example, women are still seen as being better suited to care for young children, and males are still associated with physical strength and aggression. Caring for young children requires nurturing; being a bouncer entails just the opposite, aggression.

The passivity associated with women and the activity with men has not disappeared. Important in regards to the social construction of "masculinity" is that both males and females in the study saw bouncer as being more suitable for males, whereas males were less likely to see themselves as being suited to the occupation of daycare worker. It could be interpreted that females find emotional qualities in men, such as sensitivity and caring acceptable, but that they see men as more aggressive. Males on the other hand tend to view the care

of young children as being "better suited" for women, thus they reject the idea that the emotional qualities associated with the occupation are "male". This is linked to gender role rigidity in that gender rigid males did not extend their role to the private sphere. However, males are no more likely to see the occupation of bouncer as being better suited to females, than female respondents are. Thus, males appear willing to accept that women can do a "male type" job, but are less willing to accept the idea that males can do a "female type" job.

Overall gender rigid male respondents type more than female respondents and tend to emphasize occupations which are currently dominated by women and are low in pay and prestige like daycare worker, secretary, bank teller, and social worker. Female respondents tend not to type women into these occupations to the same degree as males. With the exception of nurse, which is one of the better paid occupational groups for women, and maid, female respondents allow for more flexibility in job suitability.

When it comes to suitable male occupations, gender rigid male respondents are also less flexible. Although females and males typed bouncer and soldier highly, females are less likely to see men as being better suited for technical trades like plumbing and welding. Further, males who were gender rigid tended to type occupations as "male" if they were blue collar (welder, plumbing), or required travel, as in the occupations of trucker and pilot. Males as well as females typed those occupations which required aggression (bouncer, soldier) as more suitable for males.

The relationship between gender role rigidity and gender role suitability is stronger among the males in this sample. Gender rigid males still associate female professions with nurturing (daycare, nursing, social work), or domesticity (maid), or service (secretarial, bank teller), and creativity (ballet dancer and hairdresser). The characteristics of these types of occupations mirror some of the tasks women do in the home. Since gender rigid males are unwilling to cross the gender boundary in terms of the private sphere, depicting occupations in the public sphere which involve domesticity and care giving as being "better suited" for females reinforces the idea that males are not suited for housework and child rearing.

IDEAL GENDER TYPE CONSTRUCTION AND GENDER

The second variable thought to be related to gender role rigidity, ideal gender type construction, turned out to be related more to gender, than gender role rigidity. Males gave similar responses to each other, irrespective of gender role rigidity, and so did females. Ideal gender type construction was measured in two parts. First, respondents were asked to describe the traits they most admired in women and men. Secondly, respondents were asked who they most admired and who they least admired and why. It should be noted that ALL traits which were mentioned are listed in the following tables, regardless of duplication.

The goal of the first part was to compare the gender expectations expressed in this study with those of the Broverman study (Broverman et al., 1972). Broverman characterized traits as either passive or active and created

two clusters: competency and emotion. He placed the passive traits under emotion, and the active traits under competency. In this study, traits were simply classified as "active" or "passive", and then compared to those adjectives found in Broverman's study. These traits were not further classified into emotional and competency clusters. Traits were deemed passive if they involved emotions which were "soft", as in sympathy or kindness, loyalty or communication; and active if they were "hard", as in strength, aggression, and determination. After the traits were listed, it was determined with the help of the judges under which heading a trait should be categorized if it was not included in the Broverman study.

Table 14 represents all the most desirable traits listed for males by males. Table 15 represents all the most desirable traits for males by female respondents. Although

TABLE 14
"ALL TRAITS MOST ADMIRRED IN MEN"
MALES (N=15)

PASSIVE

SINCERITY
COMMUNICATION
UNDERSTANDING
HONESTY
LOYALTY
THOUGHTFULNESS
HUMANITY
NICE GUY
SENSE OF HUMOUR
PATIENCE
TOLERANCE
OPENNESS
RECEPTIVE
OPEN MINDED

ACTIVE

DECISION MAKING
GOOD JUDGEMENT
WISDOM
STRONG PERSONALITY
FIRM CHARACTER
KNOWS WHERE HE'S GOING
SELF CONFIDENT
STRONG
"NOT A WIMP"
COURAGEOUS
RELIABLE
INDEPENDENT
ENTREPRENEURIAL
TAKES RISK

TABLE 15
 "ALL TRAITS MOST ADMIRIED IN MEN"
 FEMALES(N=15)

PASSIVE	ACTIVE
SENSITIVITY	STRONG
COMMUNICATIVE	SECURE
SOFT	FIRM
UNDERSTANDING	SURE OF SELF
GENTLE	LOGICAL
KIND	HARD WORKING
CAN CRY	INDEPENDENT
NOT AFRAID TO CHANGE DIAPERS	SOME ONE TO LOOK UP TO
HELP IN THE HOUSE	STRONG CHARACTER
SENSE OF HUMOUR	WON'T FALL APART
THINKS OF OTHERS	SUPPORTIVE
NOT JEALOUS	ADVENTUROUS
RESPECTS MY NEEDS	DEPENDABLE
COMPASSIONATE	RISK TAKER
EMPATHETIC	RESPONSIBLE
EMOTIONAL	PAY THE BILLS
CAN OPEN UP	INTELLIGENT
CARING	CAN MAKE UP HIS MIND
GENTLE	KNOWS WHAT HE'S DOING
COOKS	CONFIDENT
CAN LISTEN	
CAN ADMIT WEAKNESSES	
MAKES ME LAUGH	
NONTRADITIONAL	
NON DOMINATING	
NOT SEXIST	
NICE PERSON	
TALLER THAN ME	
GOOD LOOKING	

there were no significant differences in the traits listed by gender rigid and non gender rigid respondents; there were some interesting differences with regard to gender. The traits male respondents identified which were characterized as passive were qualitatively different from the ones which females mentioned. Males tended to admire traits in men which involved open mindedness and tolerance. Females, on the other hand, were much more specific. They admired traits like communication skills, sensitivity, gentleness, can cry, compassion, and can admit weaknesses. Female respondents also named behaviours which are not typically associated with the male role: "helping in the house", "changing diapers", and "cooking". Male respondents did not list these things as admirable traits in men. Female respondents were also concerned that men be non-dominating, willing to listen to them, respect what they wanted and not be sexist.

These findings differed from Brovermans. Females identified the traits they most admired in men as those which the 1972 Broverman's study found did not "stereotypically" define men. Overall, the "passive" traits female respondents admired in men are traits which were classified as "female" in the Broverman study (Broverman et al., 1972). The females in my sample appear to want men to become more "feminine" in regards to emotions and behaviours.

When it came to "active" traits, however, the characteristics males and females admire in men are not that different than the stereotypes Broverman outlined in the male

Competency cluster. Males admire men who are intelligent and self confident, know where they are going in life, can make good judgements, are "not wimps" and know how to take risks. Females also admire most of these traits but tended to extend these qualities by way of more specific examples. Female respondents want a man who "can cry" but they also expect him "to pay the bills". They want to be able to depend on him, look up to him, they expect him to be hard working and logical. Females admired a man who would support them emotionally, and who would give them direction.

Table 16 and 17 list the traits males and females admired most in women. Male respondents expected women to be independent, make decisions and be entrepreneurial. They also admired women who would nurture and coddle them, take care of them, and not talk too much or be too pushy. Female respondents admired women who were not aggressive or vindictive, and expected women to socialize their children in a positive way.

When we compare the traits individuals admire in men with the ones they admire in women we can observe visually that female respondents admire far more "passive" traits in men, and far more "active" traits in women. Male respondents on the other hand are more balanced in terms of the active and passive traits for males and females. What is interesting is that female respondents attributed characteristics to males and females which can be seen as reflecting the qualities which they felt each gender LACKED. In the list of Active traits, female respondents tended to stress that they admired those women who did not lean on men, did not give in to the pressure to get married and have children, who stood up to men, were

individuals, and not easily taken advantage of. Female respondents depicted women they knew as weak and helpless, giving examples of friends who were "miserable", "bossed around by men", and "tied down with children".

It appears, in terms of ideal type gender construction, that female respondents in this study were less satisfied with the stereotyped view of gender than males. Male respondents tended to list an almost equal number of passive and active traits for both genders as desirable. Females, however, listed far more passive than active traits for men. Unlike female respondents, the qualities males listed were more general in terms of being a "nice guy", rather than suggestive of any participation in nontraditional gender behaviour. Females were far more accepting of crossing the gender boundary in regards to both males and females. Inversely, males did not advocate any outstanding or specific gender mixing.

TABLE 16
 "ALL TRAITS MOST ADMIRIED IN WOMEN"
 MALES(N=15)

 PASSIVE

CARES FOR ME
 TAKES CARE OF ME
 LOVING
 AFFECTIONATE
 NURTURING
 NOT EMOTIONALLY FRIGID
 LOYAL
 CODDLES ME
 GOOD BODY
 LIKES TO CUDDLE
 HONEST
 FLEXIBILITY
 TRUST WORTHY
 SENSE OF HUMOUR
 SINCERITY
 CARING
 COMMUNICATIVE
 NOT PUSHY
 FUN
 OPEN
 DOESN'T TALK ALL THE TIME
 HUMANITY

ACTIVE

INDEPENDENT
 KNOWS HER OWN MIND
 MAKES GOOD JUDGEMENTS
 INTELLIGENT
 CAN'T PUSH HER AROUND
 TAKES MATTERS INTO HAND
 STRONG PERSONALITY
 ENTREPRENEURIAL
 STRAIGHT FORWARD
 TAKES ADVANTAGE OF SITUATION

TABLE 17
 "ALL TRAITS MOST ADMIRIED IN WOMEN"
 FEMALES(N=15)

PASSIVE	ACTIVE
COMMUNICATION	OUTSPOKENNESS
UNDERSTANDING	INDEPENDENT
PATIENT	SPEAKS HER MIND
HUMOUR	SERIOUS
CAN LISTEN	WISE
WELL ROUNDED	ASSERTIVE
CALM	ASSERTIVE
SENSITIVE	KNOW FINANCES
NOT AGGRESSIVE	STAND ON HER OWN
KINDNESS	SELF AWARENESS
NOT VINDICTIVE	SELF AWARE
POSITIVELY SOCIALIZES CHILDREN	THINKS FOR HERSELF
	DRESSES PROFESSIONALLY
	STAND UP FOR HERSELF
	BE WHAT SHE WANTS TO BE
	CAN HANDLE MEN
	DOESN'T BOW TO PRESSURE
	TO HAVE CHILDREN,GET
	MARRIED
	KNOWS WHAT SHE WANTS
	WON'T COMPROMISE FOR MEN
	NOT HELPLESS
	NOT TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF
	CONFIDENT
	CAN TAKE CHARGE
	DON'T NEED MEN
	FULFILS SELF
	INDIVIDUALISTIC
	COURAGEOUS
	STRONG
	EXPLORER
	KNOW HER PRIORITIES
	SELF SUPPORTIVE
	SELF RELIANT
	STRONG WILLED
	SELF AFFIRMATIVE
	TOUGH
	ABILITY TO SUCCEED
	HAS INNER STRENGTH

The second part of the variable of Ideal Gender Type construction asked respondents to name who they most admired and why, as well as who they least admired and why. The first general observation to be made about this question is that many of the respondents could not answer it. Although the possible range of answers was broad in that the respondent could have named a person they knew personally, a character on television or in a book, a historical figure and so on; 8 respondents could not think of anyone they most admired, and 5 could not think of anyone they least admired.

Out of the 10 male respondents who answered the question, 7 admired a male character, 2 simply identified admirable characteristics, and 1 said he admired his sister. The characters males admired were either historical figures such as Ghandi or Napoleon, or characters in books or on television who had adventures, went to the moon or climbed mountains. The characteristics identified included risk taking, independence, self-actualization, and being in touch with themselves.

Female respondents were also likely to admire characters of the same gender. Of the 12 that answered the question, 8 admired women, and 4 admired men. Of the women who were admired, 5 were family members, either their sisters, mothers, or grandmothers. These women were admired for enduring hardships, abandoned or neglected by their husbands, these women raised their children on their own, and basically suffered in silence. One respondent admired her sister for setting goals in life and attaining them. A further 3 of the 8 admired women who were either feminist writers such as Margaret

Atwood and Angela Carter, or Clara Barton who started the Red Cross and Janis Joplin who overcame abuse and hardship to become "someone". The 4 female respondents who admired men listed Martin Luther King Junior, who believed in achieving his goals in a peaceful way, and Henry Morgenthau who stands up for women's right to abortion. Another female respondent admired one of her university professors whom she said was "shy" and "sensitive". Another mentioned the writer Douglas Adams.

We can see that the characters males and females most admire differ substantially. With the exception of one male who admired his sister, none of the characters admired by males were women. Further, all the characters embodied "active" traits like adventure, battle or courage. Females, on the other hand, admired women more, and further, it was women they knew personally for the most part. Females also admired courage in women, but the courage was of a very different nature -- that of endurance. The description of "hardships", "broken dreams", or "unfulfilled potential" was a persistent theme. The admiration female respondents held for women in their families was tempered by the perception that endurance is synonymous with dignity. Thus, what female respondents admired most in women was courage and dignity of a "passive" variety (i.e., the ability to "hold it in" and "accept" things without complaint or without fighting back). Males admired "spirit": standing up and "being counted", "making a statement", and changing something. Males admired courage that was ultimately more "active" in its variety.

With respect to the characters which respondents said

they LEAST admired, both males and females were more likely to mention male figures. In fact, only one male respondent disliked a female, a fellow student he knew whom he said, "complained about everything and I am tired of her". The period of time these interviews were conducted corresponded with the beginning of the war in the Gulf. This may be why six males named George Bush and Saddam Hussein as the characters they least admired, as did 2 of the females.

The comedian Andrew Dice Clay was mentioned as being the character least admired by 1 male and 2 females because "he promoted hatred against women and other minority groups". Two of the males named television characters like Rocky and Eric Estrada of CHIPS fame claiming that they gave an unrealistic picture of men as "macho" men. They also objected to the overt "violent image of men".

Female respondents named Hitler, and the Klu Klux Klan as those characters they least admired, as well as Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge because "they have killed a lot of people". One female respondent mentioned Tarzan as the character she least admired due to "the caveman mentality". This caveman mentality, she said, "was what was at the root of sexism". Helen Brown, the editor of Cosmopolitan magazine, Earnest Hemingway, and Freud were named by females as "all promoting sexist images of women". Priests as well as Jim Baker were signalled out by women because they "stand for certain principles" and then betray them by "lying" and "molesting children". Finally, one respondent said the character she least admired was her father because "he has a lot of power and money but he can't communicate emotionally and ignores the needs of

my mother and myself".

Overall, women are more likely to dislike characters they feel are insensitive to the needs of women, or who put down women in some way, or who give false images. Males are more likely to dislike political figures or television personalities which make men look "stupid" or exaggerate men's power in some way. Interestingly, males seem to dislike characters like "Rocky" possibly for the same reasons females dislike people like Helen Brown (the editor of Cosmo magazine) or Tarzan -- because they promote sexist images, and are not representative of women and men in reality. In my sample, females were more likely than males to dislike those characters or individuals who reinforced or promoted the oppression of women or the oppression of other groups. Possibly this is because women are themselves the victims of discrimination.

Males in my sample can be seen as more traditional than females when it comes to who they are likely to identify with and/or would like to emulate. They appear to aspire to characters or characteristics which are connected with the social construction of masculinity. Females, on the other hand, can be seen as less traditional because they were more likely to admire women. These women were seen to have courage of the defensive (passive), rather than the offensive (active) variety. However, this type of courage was viewed as an inner strength, rather than as a weakness.

When it came to masculinity, 2 of the females in this sample tended to have some expectations in terms of "traditional" masculine behaviour. For example, one female who

was inconsistent in her responses, said:

Men should have the final say in things...but only if they earn it. If they take responsibility in terms of being the breadwinner then...yes..I think that gives them the right to make the major decisions (F4).

This respondent felt that major decisions were those like "moving to another town" or "spending large sums of money", or where to go on vacation. Another female respondent stated:

I expect men to take some responsibility...pay the bills...you know. Take care of me (F1).

Some female respondents depicted males as "irresponsible" and "insensitive" and felt that men owed them something in some way. These females were ready to give the final say to men, but at a cost. This "cost" was financial. These expectations consisted of men paying a price for their dominance.

Females also tended to report stories of men who had not fulfilled their gender role obligations as in "not taking care of their families". Even though these respondents expected to follow a career, they admired a man who could make them feel "financially secure". One female stated:

I want to know he's there for me, to take care of me if I don't want to work...he should support me in anything I want to do, not fall apart, understand my needs, be firm with me when I need it (F4).

In spite of these descriptions, most females in this sample could be characterized as more feminist in orientation. They expressed a need to "pursue a career", "resist pressure to have children and marry", and a desire to "have men take their share of household chores". They also had more positive things to say of men in general and were less restrictive in terms of

proscriptions for "masculinity". These females appeared more secure in the new role imposed on women in our society, the role of economic independence. They appeared unwilling to give the last say to men, but also did not expect men to financially support them. They also were not put off by the idea of being the main breadwinner. As one of these female respondents stated:

He should do things that make him happy rather than be worried about making tons of money. I would support him in anything he wanted to do...if he wanted to stay home and paint or do housework...or be anything. It's important that he does what makes him happy...and that he can make me laugh (F6).

Another female respondent said:

I want a guy who can listen to me talk, who is sensitive, is not afraid to cry or admit his weaknesses...who wants a partner, a friend, not someone to boss me around all the time (F7).

It appears from this sample, that females have less traditional expectations than males in terms of what they expect from men. In fact, most females in the sample wanted men to change, to become more "feminine". Clearly these respondents were intolerant of the status quo for men as well as women.

The two females who did have a tendency to support the status quo for males, did not accept it entirely for females. These respondents wanted some right to make their own decisions in regards to career, and other issues, but also wanted men to maintain some of the obligations of "masculinity" especially when it came to financial support. This suggests that it is not just males who reinforce the traditional aspects of "masculinity".

Females and males in my sample listed many traits which fit the "sturdy oak" theme identified by David and

Brannon (1976:12). The authors defined this theme of masculinity as "A manly air of toughness, confidence, and self reliance". Further, respondents also identified some characteristics pertaining to "The Big Wheel" category, which includes, "Success, Status, and the need to be looked up to" (David and Brannon, 1976:12). For the most part, however, the traits identified fit the "sturdy oak" theme. Traits such as "being supportive", "confident", "not a wimp", "determined", "know where he's going in life", "can make good judgements", and being "strong".

The adherence to the "sturdy oak" theme is most likely a result of the high level of education among the respondents, as well as the social class. I would not expect respondents to list characteristics of David and Brannon's "Give 'em hell" theme, which they see as "the aura of aggression, violence and daring". Although there were some traits which fit this category, such as "risk taking" and "adventurous", these were not typical of the traits described. David and Brannon explain that the theme of the "Give 'em hell" type of masculinity:

...is more typically working class than middle class, but has deep roots in the general American experience (David and Brannon, 1976:30).

Thus, it is apparent that traditional expectations of "masculinity" are still more valued than are the "traditional" aspects of femininity. With that in mind, I will now turn to the two variables which are thought to be related to homophobia/homosexism.

SEXUAL FIXEDNESS, HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM, AND GENDER

The idea that homophobic/homosexist respondents will be more likely than non homophobic/homosexist respondents, to see sexuality as fixed is an important one. If heterosexuality is connected with masculinity (Kinsman, 1987), homophobic/homosexist respondents will be more likely to connect sexuality with gender. The connection of sex and gender may well be an important link between gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism. The first question related to sexual fixedness asked respondents why they thought some men were homosexual (see table 18), and why some women were lesbians (see table 19). What is striking about the findings is that respondents expressed different reasons for male homosexuality than they did for lesbianism. We can see that 7 males listed genetics as the main reason for homosexuality, as compared to only 3 females. One female, and 4 males saw homosexuality as a result of sickness or ugliness. On the other hand, 9 males saw lesbianism as being a choice, as compared to 5 of the females. Females were more inclined to view male homosexuality as a result of socialization (8), while none of the males held that view. Of females, 5 tended to see lesbianism as a result of a bad experience with the other gender, as did 4 of the males.

Males in general tended to view male homosexuality in one of two ways: genetic or the result of being sick and ugly. In fact, 11 of the 15 males in the sample saw homosexuality in this way. Homophobic/homosexist males were more likely to believe that homosexuality was a result of sickness/ugliness than non homophobic/homosexist males. All 3 of the homophobic/

TABLE 18
"REASONS FOR HOMOSEXUALITY BY GENDER,
AND HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM"

FEMALES (N=15)				MALES (N=15)		
*	HOM.	N.HOM.	T	HOM.	N.HOM.	T
CHOICE	0	2	2	2	2	4
GENETIC	2	1	3	2	5	7
BAD EX	0	1	1	0	0	0
SOCIAL	0	8	8	0	0	0
SICK/ UGLY	1	0	1	3	1	4

TABLE 19
"REASONS FOR LESBIANISM BY GENDER, AND HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM"

FEMALE (N=15)				MALE (N=15)		
*	HOM.	N.HOM.	T	HOM.	N.HOM.	T
CHOICE	0	5	5	5	4	9
GENETIC	0	0	0	1	1	2
BAD EX	2	3	5	1	3	4
SOCIAL	0	4	4	0	0	0
SICK/ UGLY	1	0	1	0	0	0

*HOM. = HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS
N.HOM. = NON HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS
T. = TOTAL NUMBER WHO GAVE THAT RESPONSE BY GENDER

homosexist females in the sample viewed male homosexuality as either genetic, or a result of sickness and ugliness. However, most males in my sample tend to view male homosexuality in one of these two ways, be they homophobic/homosexist or not.

On the other hand, lesbianism is viewed differently. Homophobic/homosexist males (5) as well as non homophobic/homosexist males (4) saw lesbianism as a choice. Non homophobic/homosexist females (5) also saw lesbianism as a choice. An almost even number of the females (2 homophobic/homosexist and 3 not) saw lesbianism as a result of a bad experience. There was only one female who saw lesbianism as a result of sickness/ugliness. This female was also the only gender rigid female in the sample. Further, 4 non homophobic/homosexist females saw lesbianism as a result of socialization. None of the males saw lesbianism in that way.

The way in which respondents distinguished between the reasons for homosexuality and lesbianism, and how those differences varied depending on the gender requires examination. We must ask why this difference between homosexuality and lesbianism appears, and the role which gender and homophobia/homosexism play in the variance.

What is clear is that many males in the sample characterized homosexuality in a way which makes them, as "heterosexuals", safe from it. Most (11) reasoned that homosexual men were either genetically programmed to engage in sexual activity with members of their own sex, or victims of an illness. This way of conceptualizing homosexuality makes one

secure that they would never be attracted to another man themselves because it is not "in the genes". There were 5 homophobic/homosexist males who viewed male homosexuality in one of these two ways. Non homophobic/homosexist males (6) also tended to view it this way.

Males were more willing to see lesbianism as a choice, be they homophobic/homosexist or not. Some dominate themes voiced by male respondents were: "women can engage in same sex activity more easily than a man", "women touch differently", "women can give each other tenderness that a man is unable to", and "women turn to other women sometimes because men are pigs, they may have been raped or beaten by a man and say, hey I am fed up with men altogether". Females in the sample also saw lesbianism as a choice, (5), or as a result of a bad experience with the opposite sex (2 out of 5 were homophobic/homosexist). Females felt that women turned to lesbianism after being raped or beaten by a man and one respondent recounted a story of a lesbian woman she knew who had been raped by a man in a club with a broken bottle held to her throat. "It was after that", she said, "she became a lesbian".

Unlike males in the sample, many females felt that homosexuality in men was a result of socialization in that "some men reject the macho image", or, "they just don't incorporate the same norms or get the same messages". Thus, females make homosexuality much more of a possibility than do men in that they do not see it as genetic. Females are also more likely to think that lesbianism is the result of socialization, than males are.

Males who saw homosexuality as a "choice or a

"preference" were more likely to view homosexuality as something which was not fixed. For example, one male who said homosexuality was a choice claimed:

You never know what could happen, I can't say that I'd never be attracted sexually to a man even if I am a heterosexual (M1).

Another male who saw homosexuality as a choice stated:

I work with a guy who's gay and I am curious you know. I am straight but who says I will never in my life sleep with a man. They say the sex is great (M2).

There was no significant difference between male and female responses in relation to the idea of a heterosexual having a sexual encounter with a homosexual man/lesbian (Qs 13 & 18). In view of question 13, few males or females agreed that a heterosexual man would become sexually involved with a homosexual man, without qualification (3 homophobic/homosexist males and 5 females, 2 of which were homophobic/homosexist). More respondents overall (7 females and 9 males) felt that a heterosexual woman could become sexually involved with a lesbian (Q 18). The most significant difference was among males themselves: only 3 non homophobic/homosexist males agreed that the male homosexual/heterosexual experience was possible, but 9 males believed the lesbian/heterosexual relationship was possible (3 homophobic/homosexist).

Males were more likely to believe that a heterosexual woman could become involved sexually with a lesbian. This is possibly because males did not see lesbianism as innate like they did homosexuality.

Respondents were asked to agree or disagree to the statement that sex between two women was as "natural" as

between a man and a woman; as well as, if they agreed or disagreed that sex between two men was as "natural" as sex between a man and a woman. Only 6 females disagreed to both statements, including all 3 who were homophobic/homosexist. However, there was again a difference among males themselves, in that 9 males, (6 of which were homophobic/homosexist) disagreed that sex between two men was as "natural" as between a woman and a man. Only 5 males disagreed that lesbian sex was "as natural", only 1 which was homophobic/homosexist. Although females are as likely to agree to the first statement as to the second, males are inclined to believe that sex between two women is more "natural" than between two men.

One male who did not believe that sex between two men was as "natural" as between a man and a women, stated:

There is no way that a straight guy would become involved with a gay guy...like why would he, unless he was bisexual to begin with (M3).

Another male who felt the same way stated:

Unless he was forced or drunk out of his head...and he didn't know that it was a guy...you know...it was dark...other wise no way! I don't know what makes a guy do that stuff...something in the genes goes bad maybe (M4).

Yet another said:

The guy would have to be sexually confused or going through some crisis or something..I can't see it (M6).

In terms of how sexuality is viewed in this sample, the greatest difference relates to how homosexuality and lesbianism is seen among males. Homophobic/homosexist or not, males tend to view homosexuality in men as innate, more fixed, and less natural. Females, on the other hand, do not tend to see lesbianism as any more innate, fixed, or less natural than

male homosexuality. Males in general appear to be more threatened by male homosexuality than females are by lesbianism. Although it is difficult to draw any elaborate conclusions with a sample of this size, the idea of sexual fixedness is more apparent in males when it comes to same sexed homosexuals. In order to feel secure in being "masculine", heterosexuality, must be conceptualized as something which is consistent with the role. The belief that sexuality is fixed allows males a sense of security in a role which is not well defined, except in terms of its sexual orientation, and its aversion to "femininity".

Since homophobic/homosexist individuals appear to see homosexuality as a threat which should stay in the closet, the data collected concerning sexual fixedness indicates that these individuals deal with the "threat" of homosexuality by viewing it as "unnatural", and in the "genes", as do those males who are not homophobic/homosexist. It is thought that "heterosexual" men would never engage in sex with another male because they are not "biologically programmed" to. To further ensure that they would never engage in this kind of sex, men tend to avoid contact and feel society would be a better place if homosexuality remained "hidden".

On the surface, there appears to be a contradiction. If homosexuality is thought to be "in the genes", then this implies that by virtue of biological predisposition "heterosexual" men could never be homosexual. Why then do "heterosexual" men view homosexuality as a threat. I argue that it is the myth of gender inversion which, on the one hand confuses sexuality with gender, and on the other, serves to

remind males that to act in any way seen as feminine will cause them to lose status and be labelled a homosexual. In order to determine if homophobic/homosexist respondents confuse sexuality with gender, the issue of sexual inversion will now be examined.

ATTRIBUTION OF CROSS-SEXED MANNERISMS AND TRAITS

The theory suggests that there is a relationship between the attribution of cross-sexed mannerisms and traits and homophobia/homosexism. In order to test this relationship, respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements that most male homosexuals have "feminine" characteristics; and most lesbians have "masculine" characteristics. Further they were read a list of occupations and asked if they felt gays and lesbians would be more attracted to a particular occupation than their heterosexual counterpart. Respondents were also asked whether they could identify a gay male or a lesbian at a party, and if so, how.

First, it is important to note that there was no significant difference between males and females (6-6) when it came to the belief that MOST male homosexuals have some identifiable "feminine" characteristics (Q 35). Of the 6 males who agreed that gay males are feminine, 5 were homophobic/homosexist. One homophobic/homosexist female, along with 5 others who were not homophobic or homosexist also agreed. Less of the sample overall (2 homophobic/homosexist females, 2 homophobic/homosexist males) believed that MOST lesbians had some identifiable "masculine" quality (Q 38).

However, there was a significant difference between

males and females when they were asked if they would be able to identify the male homosexual at a party (Q3). As Table 20 shows, 14 males (7 homophobic/homosexist), as compared to only 6 females (2 homophobic/homosexist) said yes they would be able to identify the gay male.

Males and females gave different reasons for being able to identify gay males. Males either said that they could tell, but with difficulty, or that he would exhibit some sort of feminine behaviour or dress. Females on the other hand felt that if they identified a man as gay, it would be because of some stereotype they held.

The majority of the sample felt that they would not be able to identify the lesbian (See table 21). The non homophobic/homosexist, as well as all the homophobic/homosexist males in our sample are quite secure that they can pick a homosexual male out of a crowd (see table 20). However, only homophobic/homosexist respondents (4 males, 1 female) connected identification of the homosexual male directly with the idea that he would appear feminine. The majority of females felt that they would not be able to identify the homosexual.

TABLE 20
I.D OF HOMOSEXUAL BY GENDER, AND HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

	FEMALES (N=15)			MALES (N=15)		
	HOM.	N.HOM.	T.	HOM.	N.HOM.	T.
NO	0	9	9	1	0	1
YES/ DIFFICULT	0	0	0	1	7	8
YES/ POLITICAL	0	1	1	0	1	1
YES/ STEREOTYPE	2	2	4	1	0	1
YES/ HOMO-FEMININE	1	0	1	4	0	4

TABLE 21
I.D OF LESBIAN BY GENDER, AND HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

	FEMALE (N=14)			MALE (N=15)		
	HOM.	N.HOM	T.	HOM.	N.HOM	T.
NO	0	8	8	4	7	11
YES/ DIFFICULT	2	1	3	3	0	3
YES/ POLITICAL	0	1	1	0	0	0
YES/ STEREOTYPE	0	0	0	0	1	1
YES/ LESMASCULINE	1	1	2	0	0	0

The fact that males in my sample felt confident that they could pick the gay male out of a crowd reinforces the idea that heterosexual males need to feel that the gay man is visibly different than themselves. Morin and Garfinkle (1978) discuss an interesting finding which relates to this idea. The finding emerged in a study by Karr done in 1975 in which he placed two male confederates among a group of males in a controlled experiment. One confederate was labelled a homosexual by the other confederate and then the group was asked to rate each other on a number of attributes, such as masculinity, personality etc. Karr's findings revealed that the homosexually labelled confederate rated as "less masculine", "softer", and was preferred less overall by group members. More interestingly, the confederate who did the labelling was seen as "more masculine" and more "sociable" when he labelled than when he did not. Morin and Garfinkle state of Karr's finding:

The author suggested that men who demonstrate ability to simply identify another man as a homosexual are rewarded and reinforced by other men in our culture for possessing that skill (1978:41).

Thus, it appears that within our society males are not only expected to avoid behaviours which will invite the label of "sissy" or "fag", they are also expected to know who the "sissy" and "fags" are.

My data support the findings of Morin and Garfinkle: not only are the males more concerned with gender "appropriate" behaviour, but more males than females, feel that they can identify a gay man. It should be further stressed that because male respondents believe they would be able to pick a gay male

out of a crowd, sexual orientation is related to gender. If he is easy to pick out because he is gay, then he is different in some way or other from the heterosexual man. Even if identifying him is "difficult", it is felt that there is some subtle difference between the gay and the "heterosexual" man in our society.

All the males who labelled gay men feminine were homophobic and homophobic. This leads me to conclude that if females have a lower status than males in our society then gay males do also because they are seen as "feminine". The threat homophobic/homosexist males feel from homosexuality may be interpreted as a challenge to traditional gender roles. Since gay males are biologically male but socially can transform themselves into females, then all men, regardless of sexual orientation could potentially lose status. Men who are viewed as acting like females should, according to homophobic/homosexists, stay hidden in the closet.

Sexual fixedness can then also be seen as an expression of gender role rigidity. Gender role rigid and homophobic/homosexist males see females as biologically unequal. They also see gay men as biologically unequal since they expressed the opinion that homosexuality was biological, and that gay men appear like women. If gay men appear like females, then they could potentially take the social and the sexual role of females in society. Gender rigid males were not willing to cross the boundary when it came to doing housework, taking primary responsibility for the family, and being less experienced sexually than women. Although gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist males had no objection to giving equal

rights to homosexuals in regards to the public sphere, (teaching), they were not willing to extend those rights to the private sphere (the adoption of children). Interestingly, they were unwilling to consider extending equal rights to women in the private sphere. Thus, it appears that gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist males are willing to extend equality only on the condition that it does not challenge their role, or the traditional roles of the family.

Tables 22, 23, and 24 present the stereotypes which were offered by respondents in this sample to describe gay men in relation to mannerisms, appearance, and other traits. This variable was designed to further explore this idea of gender inversion. There is the opinion that gay males are easy to identify because they are thought to appear feminine. The following tables take a closer look at the adjectives which are used to describe gay men, as well as lesbians in our society.

Gay males are attributed with many characteristics which in regards to mannerisms, appearance and other traits are thought to be typically "female". As can be seen in table 22, gay males are thought to speak in higher voices, have nervous giggles, limp wrists, and loose and fluid arm movements. They touch a lot, themselves as well as other people, and cross their legs. They strut when they walk, and talk and act like women. Homophobic/homosexist respondents tended to make more reference to the idea that gay males were "feminine" or "effeminate". Gay males are also seen to be concerned with their appearance (cf. table 23): their clothes are well

TABLE 22
GAY MALE STEREOTYPES/MANNERISMS

Loose and limp arm movements
Crosses legs
Lisps
Stresses certain letters, especially S's
Feminine voice
Covers mouth when he laughs
Weak voice
Exaggerates movements
Holds onto hand longer
Voice modulation goes up and down in volume
Dainty
Feminine traits amplified
Holds self more delicately

TRAITS MENTIONED BY HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS

Limp wrist
Nervous giggle
Have southern type accent
High pitched voice
Touches self and others more
Overly feminine
Acts feminine in nature
High voice
Soft voice
Feminine
Effeminate

TABLE 23
GAY MALE STEREOTYPES/APPEARANCE

Colourful clothes
Better dresser
Concerned with fashion and style
Wears expensive clothes
Fashion hair cuts
Has an earring
Dresses in bright colours/orange/green/pink
Dresses up
Concerned with his appearance
Better dressers than heterosexual men
Accents body more/tighter jeans
Has good fashion sense

TRAITS MENTIONED BY HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS
Leather jacket/tight jeans
Concerned with clothes
Concerned with colours
Wears makeup
Wears women's clothes

TABLE 24
GAY MALE STEREOTYPES/OTHER

Would be politically left
Political
Would have a lot of women around him
Good dancers
Anti-establishment
Good taste
Liberal attitude
Knows different things
More understanding
Talks about personal things
Polite
Caring
Can cook
Not macho
Participates in impersonal sex
More emotional
Makes a statement against masculinity

TRAITS MENTIONED BY HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS

Would talk a lot about AIDS
Would talk about being gay a lot
Can be bitchy
Better read
Likes to explore sexually
Likes to experiment sexually
Have a broader view of issues
More tolerant
See the grey, not just the black and white
Identifies more with women
More sensitive

coordinated, they wear bright colours, earrings and make-up. They also dress in women's clothing, and wear tighter more alluring clothing which accents their bodies. Only homophobic/homosexist respondents claimed that gay men wear makeup and women's clothes.

Gay men are also described as being anti-establishment, always talking about politics, AIDS, and their own sexuality (cf. Table 24). According to our sample, gay men are also better dancers, more tolerant, and more caring, sensitive and emotional than heterosexual men. Only homophobic/homosexist respondents connected gay men with talking about being gay and AIDS all the time, being bitchy, being more experimental sexually, identifying more with women than men, and being more sensitive.

The majority of the respondents in my sample implied that gay men were "feminine" in one way or another, either by "crossing their legs", or having "amplified feminine traits". Two of the female respondents tended to see gay men as erotic, in regards to the way they dressed, and felt that they engaged in "impersonal sex". One non homophobic/homosexist female respondent said:

This guy a friend pointed out to me in the cafeteria one day was gay. I didn't know until my friend told me to look at him. He was wearing this low cut T-shirt...the kind with no arms and really short nylon shorts. He had a great body...after I looked at him awhile I knew he was gay...we were dressed so conservative compared to him (F2).

A male homophobic/homosexist respondent described the difference in dress he perceived to be "gay" in a totally different way:

I saw these two guys on the metro this morning and it was obvious they were gay. They were in their late 30s and were wearing super tight jeans and leather jackets with little chains hanging off them. No straight guy would dress like that (M3).

In this example the clothing is still tight but is described in a more negative way than in the former example. Of fashion, one non homophobic/homosexist female stated:

I work in a boutique and I know gay when I see it...they have it all together. They know how to coordinate their colours and their clothes...not like heterosexual men (F3).

One homophobic/homosexist male respondent who had hung around in gay bars in Toronto with a group of actors said:

Gay men are more intelligent...better rounded. They are much more interesting to talk to...and they're better dancers. However, they get bitchy sometime... If it wasn't for the sex thing...they were always trying to come on to me...that's why I wouldn't have one as a friend (M4).

The majority of females indicated that gay men were much nicer to talk to, more caring, and would make better friends than heterosexual men because they would have more in common with women. Although stereotypical, the description females provided of gay men tended for the most part to be far more positive than the one males gave. If some females attributed "feminine" characteristics to gay men, males tended to see them as "effeminate". That is, the depiction of gay males by males in my sample was usually one of exaggerated "femininity". Further, females seemed attracted to gay men: they depicted them as being physically attractive, polite, good, as well as caring individuals. Some of what male respondents said about gay males was positive, although these

males were in a minority. Positive statements about gay men by males included, feeling that homosexual men were more tolerant and better read. Some males also felt that gay men were more dynamic and would be more willing to experiment and explore sexually than heterosexual men.

The characteristics attributed to homosexual men were far more extensive than those attributed to lesbians. Lesbians were not defined by as many cross-sexed mannerisms and traits as were gay men. Tables 25, 26 and 27 present the characteristics used to describe lesbians in terms of mannerisms, appearance, and other aspects.

Lesbians, like gay men, were thought to be political and left wing. The lesbian was seen as tougher and more aggressive than the heterosexual women. They were also thought not to like men. Homophobic/homosexist respondents saw lesbians as "masculine", "composed", and "sitting anyway she likes", "having had bad experiences with men", and "having bad attitudes towards men". Characteristics, like "not afraid", "can take control in a group", "makes her thoughts known", "assertive" and so forth are viewed as admirable traits in our society because they are traits associated with masculinity.

TABLE 25
STEREOTYPES OF LESBIANS/MANNERISMS

Not feminine
Sits and talks like a man
Strong voice
Touches differently
Aggressive
Macho
Tough
Ultra feminine

TRAITS MENTIONED BY HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS

Masculine
Sits anyway she likes
Doesn't cross her legs
Moves around
Composed
Assertive
Self confident
Gives firmer hugs

TABLE 26
STEREOTYPES OF LESBIANS/APPEARANCE

Short hair
Shaved head
Leather jacket and boots
No makeup
Push up bras and lots of makeup
no bra
wears one earring
Black shoes
Dresses more mature and serious than heterosexual women
Dresses for comfort

TRAITS MENTIONED BY HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS

Hair not styled
Dresses more neutral than gay man
Does not dress like a man or a woman
Jeans and T-shirt
Dresses like a guy
Baggy jeans
Baggy shirt or halter

TABLE 27
STEREOTYPES OF LESBIANS/OTHER

Does not flirt with men
Does not like men
Talks about feminism and women's issues
Socialist and anti-establishment
Against Status Quo
Makes thoughts known

TRAITS MENTIONED BY HOMOPHOBIC/HOMOSEXIST RESPONDENTS

Has had bad experience with men
Lesbians hate men
Have got the shaft from men
Have bad attitudes towards men
Has control in a group
Not afraid of anything

The traits which were listed as those which were most admired in females were some of the same traits applied to the lesbian. Being aggressive, being in control, and speaking their mind are all admirable traits. The lesbian carries less stigma because she is, like women who cross the gender boundary, thought to be improving her status.

In view of the social control of masculinity, we can see that gay men and lesbians are thought to cross the gender boundary in terms of their social behaviour. Due to gender inequality in our society, it is the gay man who is seen as losing status because he is thought to identify with women. Because sexuality and gender are thought to be interrelated in our society, a man's participation in sex with another man is thought to alter one's gender behaviour. This is likely why gender rigid respondents are also homophobic and homosexist. In order to be "masculine", a man must not participate in sexual activity with other men, and must not run the risk of appearing like a woman. One action appears to imply the other.

The final question in this area asked respondents to indicate which occupations they felt gay men and lesbians would be "more attracted to" than their heterosexual counterparts. A list of occupations was read to them (cf. Appendix A., questions 7 & 10 for a list of the occupations). Tables 28 and 29 present these findings.

TABLE 28
 AGREE OCCUPATION HOLDS MORE ATTRACTION FOR HOMOSEXUAL MEN BY
 GENDER, AND HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM

OCCUPATION	FEMALES (N=15)			MALES (N=15)		
	HOM	N.HOM	T.	HOM.	N.HOM	T.
HAIRDRESSER	3	6	9	7	5	12
FASHION	3	5	8	7	5	12
DRESSMAKER	3	5	8	7	3	10
FLORIST	3	4	7	7	3	10
SOCIAL WORK	3	3	6	7	2	9
BALLET	3	1	4	7	2	9
NURSE	3	3	6	6	0	6
BABY SIT	3	1	4	5	0	5
HOUSEKEEPER	3	0	3	3	1	4
BANK TELLER	1	1	2	3	0	3
SOLDIER	0	2	2	0	2	2
POLICE	0	2	2	0	0	0
TRUCKER	0	2	2	0	0	0
BOUNCER	0	2	2	0	0	0

TABLE 29
 AGREE OCCUPATION HOLDS MORE ATTRACTION FOR LESBIANS BY
 HOMOPHOBIA/HOMOSEXISM, AND GENDER

OCCUPATION	FEMALES(N=15)			MALES(N=15)		
	HOM.	N.HOM	T.	HOM.	N.HOM	T.
SOLDIER	2	2	4	4	0	4
BOUNCER	2	2	4	3	0	3
POLICE	3	0	3	0	0	0
CONSTRUCTION	1	0	1	1	1	2
TRUCKER	1	0	1	0	2	2
SOCIAL WORK	0	2	2	0	1	1
HAIRDRESSER	1	0	1	0	1	1
BALLET	0	0	0	0	1	1
NURSE	0	0	0	0	1	1

Comparing Table 28 and Table 29 reveals some significant differences. First, the percentage of respondents who agree that gay men are more attracted to certain occupations is far greater than it is for lesbians. Secondly, although both male and female respondents typed more occupations as "gay", slightly more males did so in terms of the occupations of hairdressing and fashion design. Other occupations such as florist, dressmaker, and nurse were also agreed to more by males than females, the highest difference being in the occupation of ballet dancer. Thirdly, all the male respondents who are homophobic/homosexist agree that gay men would be more attracted to occupations such as hairdressing, fashion design, and ballet; as did all 3 of the homophobic/homosexist females. This was not the case with regard to occupations for lesbians (table 29).

For lesbians, the leading occupations are soldier, bouncer and police. The difference between occupations seen as being more attractive to gay men and those seen as being more

attractive to lesbians is that they are opposite from each other with respect to "traditional" male and female occupations. A hairdresser is usually thought to be a women and soldiers are usually men. Occupations such as fashion design, ballet dancing, hairdressing and so on all are characterized by creativity. The idea that gay men have a good fashion sense, coordinate clothes and colour well, links to the idea that they would be attracted to such jobs as fashion design and dress making. Since lesbians are thought to be aggressive, assertive, and tough, they are seen as being more attracted to the occupation of soldier, police officer (but only by homophobic/homosexist females), and bouncer. The occupations of soldier and bouncer were the two top occupations respondents in my sample identified as being "better suited" for a male. In terms of hairdressing, fashion design, florist and ballet dancer; 3 males had defined hairdresser and ballet dancer as being better suited for "females", where as only one female did in terms of hairdresser, and no females labelled ballet as better suited to females.

Characteristics used to describe gay men -- like being "concerned about fashion and appearance", "emotional", "likes to touch and reveal personal things" -- are usually stereotypically associated with females. The gay man loses status due to the perception that he has abandoned some of those highly valued traits which compose "masculinity". The lesbian, however, gains some status because it is thought that she embodies those traits which are "masculine".

It is evident that gay males are stereotyped more than are lesbians, although males were no more likely to feel gay

men would be attracted to certain occupations than were females. What is obvious is that gay men are more devalued in our society than are lesbians. Further, this devaluation of gay men serves to reinforce masculinity.

The labelling of the gay male as feminine, pressure from other males, (as well as women) who are not sure if they are prepared to give up on some of the "traditional" aspects of the male role, are all factors which indeed make it more difficult for males to cross the gender boundary. In not crossing the boundary, males make it more difficult for women who are attempting to rid themselves of some of the more traditional aspects of their role. By not sharing in the private sphere they create an impossible double day burden for women, and ultimately help to maintain homophobia especially in regards to gay men.

It is important to look at the way in which gay men were depicted by the respondents in my sample in order to identify the link respondents made between being male, and being homosexual. Gay men were not really seen as "masculine" by respondents in this sample, given how they are described (See tables 22, 23, 24); but we should not be tempted to immediately say that they were seen as strictly "feminine" either. More over, gay men were depicted as exhibiting some form of "extreme" femininity which can not be seen as typical of the average woman in our society. Gay men are said to embody characteristics which are typically thought to be "feminine", in that they are more, "caring", "sensitive" and "open minded", but at the same time, they are "bitchy", "obsessed by the way they look", speak in strange southern accents, flop their

bodies around, strut, and touch themselves and everyone else a lot. Respondents described gay men as having "feminine" characteristics in that they "act like women", "talk like women", "touch like women", and "wear women's clothes". It appears that the gay man is also seen as embodying traits that are not gender bound but are perhaps seen as the result of what can happen when role deviation occurs. In other words, the gay man is not viewed purely as a male or a female, but as some form of extreme hybrid which is one dimensional in regards to his physical needs, be it in terms of adorning the body or satisfying his sexual needs. He is erotic, gorgeous, (can be physically ugly as well) and is at the same time a sexual seducer, and a freak. He represents the ever present "danger" for males who do not observe those boundaries which socially define masculinity. This image of the gay man at once presents the possibility of complete freedom of expression and, the ever ending possibility of humiliation and loss of male power.

The lesbian is not seen in the same way as the gay male. In fact, females who were homophobic/homosexist simply identified the lesbian as "masculine", or as being more "assertive", "louder", "more sure of themselves", more in "control". Even though in general it is difficult to see these attributes as "negative", there is an indication that the female respondents who did list these traits saw women who were not lesbians as lacking in them. Unless these characteristics were thought to distinguish the lesbian from the non lesbian, respondents would not have listed them as ways to "pick a lesbian out of a crowd".

Since lesbianism was seen as a result of "bad

experiences" rather than as a result of biology like the gay man was, "lesbian traits" are reactionary. That is, it can be rationalized that due to the bad experiences these women have had with men, they have "toughened up". The traits are in general "positive" not only because masculine traits are seen as more "positive" but also because they are seen as a "reaction" against "bad men". It is not that these respondents thought that it was "natural" for women to behave that way ordinarily. Lesbians were also consistently called "feminist", as feminism in general is seen as "reactionary"; many respondents appear to indicate that lesbians have some right to see themselves as "feminist".

Because masculinity is seen as more valuable, that is, is seen as the normative role, males are not able to simply act like a "female" as in the description of the gay man. Rather, the gay man is seen as "freakish" because his biological sex prevents him from making the transference to "feminine" a complete one.

The lesbian, on the other hand, begins from a lower status, that of femaleness, thus she can successfully imitate a more valued role, that of "maleness". In some sense, the lesbian "plays at being a male" and because being a male is inherently more valuable, she is not seen as "negatively" as a gay man, even if she is seen as "abnormal".

The respondents who were gender rigid and concerned with sexual fixedness in this sample looked at the lesbian with pity. The idea that one should feel sorry for the lesbian because "she has been taken advantage of by men" is by no means less homophobic/homosexist than those comments directed towards

gay men. However, what is significant is the different way in which respondents felt about homosexuals and lesbians.

The gay man, unlike the lesbian, was not excused for his sexual orientation. Rather he is seen as a "freak" -- more woman than man -- with attributes which are not typical of either gender. He is seen as the result of some genetic imbalance, (a theory which appealed to 7 of the males in my sample), or a "failure" in terms of gender identification through socialization (8 of the females in my sample embraced this theory).

The idea that the gay man has given up a social role which is considered a superior one in relation to its feminine counterpart, is looked at with disdain. Thus, the drop in status the gay man experiences is directly related to the drop in status a "heterosexual" man would experience if he crossed the gender boundary. Because that status is lower for women to begin with, the lesbian is not seen as taking a step down in status. She is, however, seen as "playing a role" which is not "natural" for women to play. Since it is not a "natural" role, it cannot be completely accepted even though it is a role which is seen as a "superior" one.

The final chapter of this work will review the central hypothesis that gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism are connected to the social construction and reinforcement of "masculinity".

CHAPTER FIVE: THE CONCLUSION

My study provided some evidence that males are more gender role rigid than females. Thus, in terms of gender and sexuality, the range of behaviour which is acceptable, is much broader for women than for men. The private sphere was one which males still saw as the domain of females, and therefore were not willing to extend equality to women in the home. This was expressed by the lack of consideration males gave to the private sphere as one of inequality for women. Extending gender equality for women in the home would imply that men must take their fair share of housework, something males were unwilling to do.

Further, my study found that males were more homophobic/homosexist than females. Working side by side with women in the public sphere was acceptable to men because it only required women to cross the boundary. However, when it came to the idea of women leading men in the public sphere, males felt that men made better leaders than women. Males in general expressed the opinion that women should take on more masculine qualities, but only females specifically outlined behaviour traditionally thought to be "female" as desirable qualities in men. For example, females in my sample wanted men to take more responsibility in the private domain, in terms of housework and childcare. Males felt that women should become more "masculine", but they did not feel that men should become more "feminine". This implies that there is a belief that

females should extend their role to cover both the private and the public sphere. However, their main responsibility should still lie with the family. Further, males still wanted the upper hand in the bedroom, and felt threatened by a more sexually experienced partner. Males, and also some females felt that women were biologically unequal to men, and that women who worked outside the home deteriorated the nuclear family.

It can be seen from this, that gender oppression for women is mainly located in the family. Men do not cross the boundary into territory they feel is really "women's", and it is thought that women's role in the public sphere should not involve leadership over men, or threaten the family in any way. It appears that the feminist movement has succeeded only in areas where legislation forces a change. The private sphere, however, involves mainly interpersonal relationships between men and women and is therefore beyond the reach of the state. It is here that the feminist movement has not been able to have a great impact, and gender rigidity and oppression reign.

Greater equality for women in the public sphere is not as threatening to masculinity because it requires little change in terms of men's gender behaviour. It is only women who must cross the boundary. This is why the feminist movement overall has had some impact on changing women's behaviour, but little impact on changing men's. For many women, as soon as they come home from work, traditional gender roles are in full play. Marlene Dixon (cited in Mackie, 1983:270), claimed that the "institution of marriage is the chief vehicle for the perpetuation of the oppression of women: it is through the role of wife that the subjugation of women is maintained."

My findings suggest that homophobia/homosexism is perfectly correlated with gender role rigidity. Males in my sample did not want to see homosexuality, or extend equal rights to them in society. Males also felt that homosexuality was a threat to society. Further, homophobic/homosexist males, as well as gender rigid males were more likely to adhere to the idea that male sexuality is fixed. They also aspired to the gender inversion myth, believing that gay males were like females. In regards to occupations, gay males were thought to cross the boundary by being more attracted to occupations which required creativity, grace, and sensitivity.

Since the only clear definition of being a man in our society is that one must not act or appear like a woman (Hartley, 1959:9), males are more rigid about not crossing the "gender boundary". Further, males are more disturbed than females by other members of their gender whom they think are not appearing appropriately "masculine". Homophobic/homosexist males in my study felt that "inappropriate" gender behaviour on the part of gay males was related to biology or sickness. The same concern was not expressed about lesbians. The concern with the gender behaviour of gay men, along with the stigma which is directed towards being a gay man in our society, reinforces gender role rigidity.

According to authors like, Kaufman (1987) and Kimmel (1987), central to the social construction of masculinity in our society is the devaluation of women, and the devaluation of homosexuality. The devaluation of "feminine" qualities was clearly evident in this sample in relation to ideal gender type construction. Males listed "masculine" traits and characters as

the ones they most admired. Males also connected gay men with "femininity". The myth that to be gay is to be feminine, was evident in the way gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist males attributed cross sex traits and mannerisms to the homosexual.

The main connection between gender role rigidity and homophobia/homosexism in men is the confusion of sexuality with gender. The more males were willing to see sexuality as separate from gender, the less concerned they were with their "masculinity". For example, non gender rigid males were willing to admit that they could possibly engage in a homosexual relationship, and did not feel any need to be able to identify the gay man in a crowd. In other words, non gender rigid males did not see the gay man as different in terms of gender role behaviour or appearance. Non gender rigid males also admitted that they could not be certain that they would never engage in sex with another male. This indicated that these respondents regarded sexual pleasure as separate from gender.

Females were less likely to connect sexuality and gender. They felt that lesbianism was less fixed, that a sexual relationship between a heterosexual woman and lesbian was possible, as was a relationship between a heterosexual man and gay man. Many of them also did not expect to be able to identify the lesbian in a crowd. These data suggest that women are less likely to believe that women who engage in sex with other women undergo gender inversion. Although many males agreed, they did not feel this way about men.

In a society which devalues both women and homosexuality, it is not surprising that males [in this sample] are concerned with masculinity, given that, stepping outside

that boundary can bring devaluation and shame. Looking at the status of the gay man and the lesbian woman in our society teaches us a great deal about the status of men and women in general. It is interesting that respondents in my study saw the lesbian as trying to escape her gender role due to "the bad experiences" she had had with men. Relationships with other women appeared to be a haven for them. Gay men, however, were seen as being "forced" to be homosexual, either through "improper socialization", or "genetics". Because being a man is highly valued in our society, it is thought that men would never "willingly" throw away that privilege (Storms, 1981:284).

The lesbian is another story. She is a woman, a member of a lower valued category of gender. It is easier to see why she would want to "abandon" that role. Further, the lesbian is thought to "hate men". The belief was expressed by some respondents that this hate drives her to lesbianism. Two assumptions are evident in this belief: one, women are not well treated by men in our society; two, women that do not engage in sex with men must hate them.

The description of the lesbian as "in control", "feminist", and "doing what she wants to do", describes how women are seen when they escape from men. It may be that some male and female respondents do not feel that women can ever be really free or in control if they engage in sexual relationships with men. Of the second assumption, relationships between men and women are defined around sexuality. Men and women, therefore, do not like each other or love each other unless sexuality is involved. Thus, lesbians are thought to "hate" men simply because they do not define their

relationships with them around sexuality.

My data also suggest that gay men are thought to "identify with women" and "have more in common with them". Females felt that gay men made better friends than non-gay men. Again it is evident that male and female relationships are mainly defined by sexuality. Thus, if a woman is having sex with a man, she can not be friends with him. Defining "maleness" and "femaleness" as polar opposites in our society, does not exactly encourage the notion that men and women can be "friends".

In view of this, we should be asking more questions about how males and females define their relationships with members of the "other" gender. It would be useful to explore the myths individuals hold regarding gay and lesbian love relationships. We must also explore in more detail the reasons why men who may appear feminine are devalued, rather than try to disprove or prove that gay men act like women.

It might be a refreshing and rewarding change to conduct a study on heterosexual men in order to determine how these men actually define "femininity", and examine what behaviours they feel they are not allowed to express. It is clear from my study that men are not permitted as much flexibility as women in terms of gender behaviour. Further, rather than try to show how different homosexual men and heterosexual men are, it might be more insightful to show what they share in common in terms of "masculinity". Perhaps the key to decreasing homophobia, especially toward gay men, is to demonstrate that gender and sexuality are not necessarily connected.

The myth that all gay men act like women is propagated to keep males within the boundary of what can be seen as the "masculine" role. Kaufman says of homophobia between men (male homosexuality): "It is a socially constructed phobia that is essential for the imposition and maintenance of masculinity" (Kaufman, 1987:121).

To be a "sissy", a "fag", a "pansy", is to be less than a man. To be less than a man is to be a woman. Our society has only two gender categories which means that there is no in between. One is either a man or a woman. Men are taught that at all costs they must avoid traits associated with being a woman or run the risk of being accused of being a homosexual. That is, those men who internalize this message are more likely to be those who are more gender rigid, and thus are more homophobic and homophobic.

Being a homosexual male in our society is to be devalued. Although he starts out at the same point as the heterosexual male biologically, he is seen as violating that privilege by not engaging in sexual relations with women. As Kinsman proposed, masculinity under capitalism is tied to the institution of the family, male domination and control over women's bodies and their sexuality (1987:44). Frank added to Kinsman's argument that heterosexuality and masculinity are connected to the present patriarchal system, allowing for its continuation (1987:161).

The status of the gay male and lesbian in our society is directly related to the status of men and women in general. The relative lack of concern with lesbianism testifies to the lack of value placed on the female role. For example, my data

reflect that respondents had fewer stereotypes of the lesbian than they did of the gay man. Since men are more valued in this society, their sexual behaviour is of greater concern, especially if it is thought to affect their monopoly of power. Further, as "masculinity" saturates the present economic and social system (Frank, 1987:161), profound changes in the male role can ultimately affect changes in the system itself. Because gay men are thought to undergo gender inversion, they are accorded a lower status than the heterosexual man. They are accorded the status of a woman. Further, any man who acts like a woman can be accused of being a homosexual and lose status.

In reality, there is little evidence to support the idea that gay men are any more or less "feminine" than heterosexual men (Kleinberg, 1978). Because our society devalues women, the propagation of this myth serves to devalue male homosexuality. It can be argued that if society valued women equally with men, the charge that gay men were "feminine" would not entail a loss in status.

The gender inversion myth also serves the purpose of increasing anxiety among men. According to my respondents, "masculinity" is not fixed, but has to be continually proven and as a consequence, men have to be especially conscious of their actions. The myth that gay men are "feminine" makes it clear that biology does not guarantee "masculinity". My data support the claim that gender role rigid and homophobic/homosexist males believe the gender inversion myth which serves the purpose of policing masculinity. It also supports Gregory Lehne (1975), who claimed that men devalue male homosexuality by connecting it to femininity, and they use homophobia and

homosexism to "police" masculinity. Thus, not only are homosexual men affected by homophobia and homosexism, so are all men. Because homophobia and homosexism maintains gender role rigidity in men, it continues to oppress women. The more rigid men are, the more femininity is devalued.

The fact that males in my sample see male homosexuality as innate makes it less threatening to those concerned about their gender behaviour. It also reinforces the idea that "masculinity" is connected to biology. In this way, the heterosexual male is "safe" from being gay because he was not born "that way".

My data demonstrate that the gay man stands as the symbol of what men have been socialized to despise and suppress in themselves, "femininity". Mythically, the gay man in our society represents the "passive" side of the human being, in essence the half which is thought to belong exclusively to women. On one hand, he is looked at with disdain because he has "lowered" himself to the status of a woman. On the other hand, there is a fascination.

Many females in my sample saw the gay male as an attractive person, both physically and emotionally. To women, he represents the male who is not afraid to express emotion, love, and warmth. The notion that the gay male identifies with women is part of the myth that he is like women. Thus, many of the females expressed the opinion that they could identify with him. The myth that gay men do possess more sensitivity, and warmth made it tempting for some women in my sample to idealize them. The softer male who is not interested in them for sex may be a pleasant alternative to the typically sexually aggressive

male.

My data show that attitudes regarding homosexuality were related to concern with respective gender roles, especially among males. Male respondents who were more concerned with gender role scripts were also less open to alternative forms of sexual expression. As stated previously, these males saw male sexuality as fixed. For example, they could not imagine themselves becoming sexually involved with a member of the same sex. Sexual behaviour was tied to gender. Male respondents, for example, who were gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist felt that only females could sexually interest them. In my sample, Kinsman's hypothesis that under capitalism, "lust acquired a gender" when homosexuality became a collective (1987:43) held true with the males who were gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist. To illustrate the way in which homosexism in terms of sexual fixedness operates among males, we can think of being male in our society as belonging to a powerful social club. Membership is exclusive to those whose sex is male. However, power and prestige are conditional upon following certain rules. All members are expected to follow these rules. When members break the rules, the whole club is shaken. When rules are broken once, they can be broken again. Finally, the whole *raison d'etre* of the club runs the danger of being questioned.

Gay men are seen to "break the rules". If these members are not excluded from the club, they could potentially lead to its destruction. The myth about gay men means they must be marginalized in order to preserve "masculinity". Heterosexual men who see sexuality as fixed want to remain

members of the "club". Consequently, they follow the rules, they watch that they do not act like women, and they watch that they do not act like homosexuals.

To question "masculinity" is to question the very social system in which we live. I have put "masculinity" under the microscope in order to penetrate the surface of that system. My findings may well serve as a laboratory of social insight long overlooked.

The main strength of my study involved the open ended format of the interviews. This style of interviewing allowed respondents to freely discuss their answers. Closed ended questions were not as insightful because this case study was an exploratory one. However, many questions were raised about the connections between gender and sexuality. Further studies should focus on how individuals regard sexuality and gender, the roles of women and men in our society, and the images of gay men and lesbians. Also, different socio-economic groups should be compared using a much larger sample. This comparison would allow for a better representation of the important factors involved in the social construction of masculinity.

The study of "masculinity" is crucial if a more equitable society is desired. Males are socialized to devalue women because they are negatively reinforced for being "feminine" (Hartley, 1959). They learn to devalue "femininity" in themselves as well as in others. As a result, women have to continue to try and prove that "in spite of" being women, they can compete with men.

We have little of a critical nature to say about "masculinity", yet we mourn the bi-products of its philosophy

each and every day. In spite of woman bashing and gay bashing, we keep encouraging men to deny their "femininity". This has a profound effect on the world in which we live. A critical look at the social construction of the male role might be the place to begin to make sense of the tragedy of male violence and destruction.

However, like the gay men in Kleinberg's bars, our society still worships at the alter of masculinity. While it does, the value of those qualities associated with the "feminine" are denied. The fact that men have these qualities, and have the right to express them, is also denied. In doing so, our society further promotes hatred against women and the men thought to act like them.

Ironically, the gender rigid and homophobic/homosexist man who believes that sexual orientation is fixed, is not really struggling against women or gay men at all, but rather he is in battle with himself. If he continues to win that battle, the conception of a society where "true" equality is extended to women and homosexuals will remain an illusion.

(APPENDIX A)

GENDER ROLE AND SEXUALITY ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE _____

FEMALE (01) _____

MALE (02) _____

TIME _____

1. IN YOUR OPINION, SHOULD MORE EFFORT BE PUT INTO HELPING WOMEN ACHIEVE EQUALITY WITH MEN IN SOCIETY? (IF YES) WHAT KIND OF THINGS SHOULD BE DONE? (IF NO, WHY NOT?)

2. WOULD YOU SUPPORT LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD GIVE HOMOSEXUAL MEN AND LESBIANS EQUAL RIGHTS WITH HETEROSEXUALS IN OUR SOCIETY?

IF NO, IN WHICH AREAS WOULD YOU BE MOST OPPOSED?

IF YES, IN WHICH AREAS WOULD YOU BE MOST SUPPORTIVE?
i.e. OCCUPATIONAL ACCESSIBILITY-TEACHING YOUNG CHILDREN
ADOPTING CHILDREN
LEGALLY SANCTIONED MARRIAGES

3. IF YOU WERE AT A PARTY WHERE ONE OF THE MALE GUESTS WAS HOMOSEXUAL, DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THAT MAN AS A HOMOSEXUAL WITHOUT IT BEING TOLD TO YOU?

IF RESPONSE = YES, WHAT IN PARTICULAR ABOUT HIM WOULD ENABLE YOU TO TELL HE WAS HOMOSEXUAL?

IF RESPONSE = NO, WHY NOT?

4. I AM GOING TO GIVE YOU SOME CARDS WITH OCCUPATIONS WRITTEN ON THEM AND I AM NOW LAYING THREE MAIN HEADINGS ON THE TABLE BEFORE YOU. IN REGARDS TO THE CARDS YOU HAVE JUST BEEN GIVEN CONTAINING THESE VARIOUS OCCUPATIONS, PLEASE PLACE THE ONES UNDER THE HEADING WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT WHICH GROUP (FEMALE/ MALE/OR BOTH) WOULD BE BETTER SUITED FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING OCCUPATIONS.

NURSE_____

SOCIAL WORKER_____

PILOT_____

SOLDIER_____

LAWYER_____

SECRETARY_____

POLITICIAN_____

DOCTOR_____

MAID_____

FLORIST_____

PLUMBER_____

BALLET DANCER_____

HOUSEKEEPER_____

DAYCARE WORKER_____

POLICE OFFICER_____

HAIRDRESSER_____

WELDER_____

TRUCKER_____

BOUNCER IN BAR_____

BANK TELLER_____

5. IF YOU WERE AT A PARTY WHERE ONE OF THE FEMALE GUESTS WAS A LESBIAN, DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THAT WOMAN AS A LESBIAN WITHOUT IT BEING TOLD TO YOU?

IF RESPONSE =YES, WHAT IN PARTICULAR ABOUT HER WOULD ENABLE YOU TO TELL THAT SHE WAS A LESBIAN?

IF RESPONSE =NO, WHY NOT?

6. WHEN YOU ARE ON A FIRST DATE WITH SOMEONE, WHO GENERALLY PAYS? WHY?

7. AS THE FOLLOWING LIST OF OCCUPATIONS ARE READ TO YOU PLEASE INDICATE WHICH ONES YOU WOULD EXPECT HOMOSEXUAL MEN TO BE MORE ATTRACTED TO THAN HETEROSEXUAL MEN? (PLEASE RESPOND "NO" FOR THEY WOULD NOT BE MORE ATTRACTED TO, OR "YES" FOR THEY WOULD BE MORE ATTRACTED TO).

DOCTOR_____

SOCIAL WORKER_____

HAIRDRESSER_____

NURSING_____

SOLDIER_____

FLORIST_____

TRUCKER_____

HOUSEKEEPER_____

BABYSITTER_____

BALLET DANCER_____

BANK TELLER_____

CONSTRUCTION WORKER_____

DRESSMAKER_____

FASHION DESIGNER_____

BOUNCER IN BAR_____

POLICE OFFICER_____

8. DO YOU CURRENTLY LIVE ALONE?

YES _____

NO _____

(IF YES, GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 9B)

8B. IS THERE AT LEAST ONE FEMALE CURRENTLY LIVING WITH YOU? (IF YES, NOTE RELATIONSHIP: IS THERE AT LEAST ONE MALE LIVING WITH YOU? NOTE RELATIONSHIP.

GO ON TO QUESTION 9A

9A. (FOR THOSE WHO RESPONDED "NO" IN QUESTION 8) IN REGARDS TO WORK YOU DO IN AND AROUND THE HOUSE, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TASKS WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU TEND TO DO ON A CONSISTENT BASIS? IF SOME OF THESE TASKS DO NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE SAY SO.

9b. (ONLY FOR THOSE WHO RESPONDED "YES" TO QUESTION 8) IF YOU WERE LIVING WITH SOMEONE, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING HOUSEHOLD TASKS WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO DO ON A REGULAR BASIS?

DISHES _____

COOKING _____

CLEANING THE OVEN _____

DUSTING _____

VACUUMING OR SWEEPING _____

DOING REPAIRS _____

TAKING OUT GARBAGE _____

MAKING BEDS _____

CLEANING THE TOILET _____

WASHING THE CAR _____

WASHING THE FLOORS _____

CLEANING OUT THE GARAGE _____

LAUNDRY _____

MOWING THE LAWN _____

PICKING UP _____

WASHING THE WINDOWS _____

10. AS THE FOLLOWING OCCUPATIONS ARE READ TO YOU PLEASE INDICATE WHICH ONES YOU WOULD EXPECT WOMEN WHO ARE LESBIANS TO BE MORE ATTRACTED TO THAN HETEROSEXUAL WOMEN? (PLEASE RESPOND "NO" FOR THEY WOULD NOT BE MORE ATTRACTED TO OR "YES" FOR THEY WOULD BE MORE ATTRACTED TO).

DOCTOR_____

SOCIAL WORKER_____

HAIRDRESSER_____

NURSING_____

SOLDIER_____

FLORIST_____

TRUCKER_____

HOUSEKEEPER_____

BABYSITTER_____

BALLET DANCER_____

BANK TELLER_____

CONSTRUCTION WORKER_____

DRESS MAKER_____

FASHION DESIGNER_____

BOUNCER IN BAR_____

POLICE OFFICER_____

11. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT HOMOSEXUALITY AND LESBIANISM CONSTITUTE A THREAT TO SOCIETY? WHY OR WHY NOT?

12. WOULD IT BE UPSETTING TO YOU IF YOU DISCOVERED THAT YOUR SEXUAL PARTNER WAS MORE SEXUALLY EXPERIENCED THAN YOU? WHY OR WHY NOT?

13. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A HETEROSEXUAL MALE TO BECOME SEXUALLY INVOLVED WITH A HOMOSEXUAL MALE? (IF YES) IN WHAT KIND OF CIRCUMSTANCE OR SITUATION DO YOU SEE THIS HAPPENING?

14. WHO IS THE PERSON OR FICTIONAL CHARACTER THAT YOU MOST ADMIRE? (CAN BE A REAL PERSON, SOMEONE YOU KNOW OR IN HISTORY, OR A CHARACTER IN A BOOK, IN A FILM, ETC) WHY?

15. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A MAN IS AND SHOULD BE 'THE KING OF THE CASTLE'? WHY OR WHY NOT?

16. DO YOU HAVE ANY MALE FRIENDS WHO ARE HOMOSEXUAL?

YES _____

NO _____

IF RESPONSE = NO DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD FEEL COMFORTABLE HAVING A HOMOSEXUAL FRIEND? WHY OR WHY NOT?

17. DO YOU HAVE ANY FEMALE FRIENDS WHO ARE LESBIANS?

YES _____

NO _____

IF "NO" DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD FEEL COMFORTABLE HAVING A FRIEND WHO WAS A LESBIAN? WHY OR WHY NOT?

18. DO YOU THINK THAT IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE FOR A HETEROSEXUAL WOMAN TO BECOME SEXUALLY INVOLVED WITH A LESBIAN? IF YES, IN WHAT KIND OF CIRCUMSTANCE OR SITUATION DO YOU SEE THIS HAPPENING?

19. HAVE YOU EVER GONE TO A BAR WHICH CATERS SPECIFICALLY TO HOMOSEXUAL MEN?

YES _____

NO _____

IF YES, UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCE DID YOU GO TO THE BAR? HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT IT?

IF NO, CAN YOU IMAGINE ANY CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE YOU MAY FIND YOURSELF IN ONE? WHAT DO YOU THINK THE BAR WOULD BE LIKE? HOW DO YOU THINK YOU'D FEEL BEING THERE?

20. HAVE YOU EVER GONE TO A BAR WHICH CATERS SPECIFICALLY TO LESBIANS?

YES _____

NO _____

IF YES, UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DID YOU GO TO THE BAR? HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT IT?

IF NO, CAN YOU IMAGINE ANY CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE YOU MAY FIND YOURSELF IN ONE? WHAT DO YOU THINK THE BAR WOULD BE LIKE? HOW DO YOU THINK YOU'D FEEL BEING THERE?

21. WHO IS THE PERSON OR FICTIONAL CHARACTER THAT YOU ADMIRE THE LEAST? WHY?

22. THE TRAITS YOU ADMIRE MOST IN A MAN ARE?

23. WHY DO YOU THINK SOME MEN ARE HOMOSEXUAL?

24. WHY DO YOU THINK SOME WOMEN ARE LESBIAN?

25. THE TRAITS YOU ADMIRE MOST IN A WOMAN ARE?

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THESE
STATEMENTS:

26. SEX BETWEEN TWO MEN IS AS NATURAL AS BETWEEN A WOMAN AND A
MAN.

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

27. A LESBIAN CAN BE EASILY SEDUCED BY THE "RIGHT" MAN.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

28. IN SPITE OF ALL THE TALK OF EQUALITY, THERE IS NO DENYING
THE NATURAL BIOLOGICAL INEQUALITY BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

29. SOCIETY WAS A MUCH BETTER PLACE WHEN HOMOSEXUAL MEN AND
LESBIANS STAYED IN THE CLOSET.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

30. WOMEN SHOULD HAVE THE CHOICE TO KEEP THEIR MAIDEN NAMES
AFTER MARRIAGE.

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

31. SEX BETWEEN TWO WOMEN IS AS NATURAL AS BETWEEN A MAN AND A
WOMAN.

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

32. CRYING DURING THE SAD PARTS OF MOVIES IS A COMPLETELY
NATURAL THING FOR A MAN TO DO.

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

33. WOMEN SHOULD BE COMPLETELY FREE TO CHOOSE IF THEY WANT AN ABORTION OR NOT.

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

34. CRYING DURING THE SAD PARTS OF MOVIES IS A COMPLETELY NATURAL THING FOR A WOMAN TO DO.

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

35. MOST MALE HOMOSEXUALS HAVE SOME IDENTIFIABLE FEMININE CHARACTERISTIC.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

36. BEING PROPOSITIONED BY A GAY MAN OR A LESBIAN WOULD UPSET ME A LOT.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

37. A GAY MAN COULD EASILY BE SEDUCED BY THE RIGHT WOMAN.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

38. MOST LESBIANS HAVE SOME IDENTIFIABLY MASCULINE CHARACTERISTIC.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

39. THE HIGHER PARTICIPATION RATE OF WOMEN IN THE LABOUR FORCE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DETERIORATION OF THE NUCLEAR FAMILY.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

40. IT WOULD BE A GOOD THING IF WOMEN WOULD BECOME MORE LIKE
MEN IN OUR SOCIETY?

AGREE=0
DISAGREE=1
MISSING DATA=8

41. WOMEN SHOULD BE GIVEN EQUAL WAGES WITH MEN FOR WORK OF
EQUAL VALUE.

AGREE =0
DISAGREE =1
MISSING DATA=8

42. BECAUSE OF THEIR AGGRESSIVE NATURES, MEN MAKE MUCH BETTER
LEADERS OVERALL.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

43. I WOULD FIND IT HARD TO RESPECT A MAN WHO STAYED HOME AND
DID HOUSEWORK WHILE HIS WIFE FOLLOWED HER CAREER.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

44. IT WOULD BE A GOOD THING IF MEN WERE TO BECOME MORE LIKE
WOMEN IN OUR SOCIETY.

AGREE=1
DISAGREE=0
MISSING DATA=8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andelin, Aubrey
1972. Man of Steel and Velvet. California: Pacific Press
- Armstrong, Pat and Hugh Armstrong
1978. The Double Ghetto Canadian Women and Their Segregated Work. Toronto: McClland and Stewart
- Aries Philippe and Andre Bejin (eds)
1986. Western Sexuality: Practice And Precept In Past and Present Times. Blackwell: Oxford Press
- Brandes, Stanley
1981. "Like Wounded Stags: Male Sexual Ideology in an Andalusian Town". In Sexual Meanings, 217-239. Ortner and Whitehead, eds. Cambridge University Press
- Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckman
1966. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Anchor
- Black, James and Dean Champion
1976. Methods and Issues in Social Research. University of Tennessee: Wiley and Sons, INC
- Broverman, I.K, D.M. Broverman et al.
1972. "Sex-role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal." Journal of Social Issues 28
- Callender, Charles and Lee M. Kochems
1983. "The North American Berdache". Current Anthropology Vol. 24, No. 4, August-October
- Collister, E. and Janet Bagnall
"Broken Homes: Conjugal Violence Leaves a Bloody Trail of Murder, Suicide". The Gazette 15 September 1990: B-5
- David, Deborah S. and Robert Brannon (eds)
1976. The Forty-nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role. New York: Random House
- Devereux, George
1937. "Institutionalized Homosexuality of the Mohave Indians". Human Biology Vol 9
- Dumont, Micheline, Michele Jean, Marie Lavigne, and Jennifer Stoddart
1987. Quebec Women: A History. Toronto: The Woman's Press
- Dunbar, J., M. Brown, and D. Amoroso
1973. "Some Correlations of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality". Journal of Social Psychology Vol. 89

- Empey, Lamar T
1982. American Delinquency: Its Meaning and Construction.
Chicago: The Dorsey Press
- Frank, Blye
1987. "Hegemonic Heterosexual Masculinity". Studies in Political Economy Vol.24, Autumn
- Goldberg, Herb
1976. The Hazards of Being Male: Surviving the Myth of Masculine Privilege. New York: Nash
- Hartley, Ruth
1959. "Sex-role Pressures and the Socialization of the Male Child". Pp 7-13 Joseph Pleck and Jack Sawyer (eds) in Men and Masculinity. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974
- Herdt, G
1981. Guardians of the Flutes. Toronto: McGraw Hill
- Hill, W. W.
1935. "The Status of the Hermaphrodite and Transvestite in Navaho Culture". American Anthropologist Vol.37
- Hite, Shere
1987. The Hite Report: Women and Love A Cultural Revolution.
New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publishing
- Hoch, Paul
1979. White Hero, Black Beast: Racism, Sexism and the Mask of Masculinity. London: Pluto Press
- Kapp Howe, Louise
1977. Pink Collar Workers Inside the World of Women's Work.
New York: Avon
- Kaufman, Michael (ed)
1987. Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change. Toronto: Oxford University Press
- Kayal, Philip M.
1977. "Homophobia in Sociology". Gai Saber Vol. 1, No. 2
Summer
- Kimmel, Michael (ed)
1987. Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity. California: Sage
- Kinsman, Gary
1987. The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada.
Montreal: Black Rose
- Kleinberg, Seymour
1978. "The New Masculinity of Gay Men, and Beyond." Pp 120-138
Michael Kaufman (ed) in Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change. Toronto: Oxford University Press,
1987

- Lehne, Gregory
1975. "Homophobia Among Men." Pp 66-88 David and Brannon (eds) in The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role. New York: Random House, 1976
- Levitt, E. E. and A.D. Klassen
1974. "Public Attitudes Towards Homosexuality". Journal of Homosexuality 1 (1).
- Lowe, Graham S.
1987. Women in the Administrative Revolution: The Feminization of Clerical Work. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Mackie, Marlene
1983. Exploring Gender Relations: A Canadian Perspective. Toronto: Butterworth
- Mead, Margaret
1935. Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies. New York: Mentor Books
- Mead, Margaret
1950. Male and Female. London: Pelican Press
- Merquior, J.G.
1985. Foucault. London: Pelican Press
- Millham J., C. San Miguel, and R. Kellogg
1976. "A Factor Analytic Conceptualization of Attitudes Toward Male and Female Homosexuals". Journal of Homosexuality Vol. 2 (1), Fall
- Morin Stephen, F. and Ellen Garfinkle
1978. "Male Homophobia". Journal of Social Issues Vol. 34, No. 1
- Pleck, H. Joseph
1981. "The Theory of Male Sex-Role Identity: It's Rise and Fall, 1936 to the Present." Pp 21-38 in Harry Brod (ed) in The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies, 21-38. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987
- Prentice, Alison, Paula Bourne, Gail Cuthbert Brandt, Beth Light, Wendy Mitchison, and Naomi Black.
1988. Canadian Women A History. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
- Reynaud, Emmanuel
1983. Holy Virility. London: Pluto Press
- Roby, Douglass
1977. "Early Medieval Attitudes Toward Homosexuality". Gai Saber Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring

Saghir, M. and E. Robins

1970. "Psychiatric Disorders and Disability in the Female Homosexual". American Journal of Psychiatry Vol. 127

Sherrill, Kenneth

1977. "Homophobia: Illness or Disease". Gai Saber Vol 1, No. 1 Spring

Seigel, Paul

1978. "Homophobia: Types, Origins, Remedies". Christianity and Crisis November 12

Siegel, Paul

1981. "Androgyny, Sex Role Rigidity, and Homophobia".

Gayspeak: Gay Male and Lesbian Communication, 142-152. James W. Chesebro, ed. New York: The Pilgrim Press

Statistics Canada

1981. "Life Expectancy of Canadians by Age". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services

1985. "Women In Canada: A Statistical Report"

Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services

1987. "Types of Crime in Canada". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services

Storms, Michael

1978. "Attitudes Toward Homosexuality and Femininity in Men". Journal of Homosexuality Vol. 3 (3), Spring

The Canadian World Almanac and Book of Facts

1991. "Educational Attainment in Canada".

Toronto: Global Press

Ungaretti, John

1978. "Pederasty, Heroism, and Family in Classical Greece".

Journal of Homosexuality Vol. 3 (3), Spring

Weinberg, George

1973. Society and the Healthy Homosexual. New York: Anchor Press

Weinberg, Martin and Colin Williams

1974. Male Homosexuals: Their Problems and Adaptations. New York: Penguin Books